

# A Few Drops Of PP



*Professor Populist*

# Table of Contents

Author's Note

1. Look! A Book!

2. Everything Massive Once Wasn't

3. Bill Gates & The COVID Craziest

4. Nullifying the Elite

5. Escaping the Cul-de-sac

6. Every Breath You Take, Every Move You Make

7. The Dual Dangers of Ephemeral & Emotionally-Manipulative Media

A Brave New Age

Puppeteered Emotions

Reality White-Out

What Lies Behind

8. Being the Butterfly

# Author's Note

Is the title a bit of juvenile toilet humor? Certainly. But there's more serious purposes as well. For instance, it's considerably harder to be painted as a sinister extremist threat by government, media, or NGOs if there's a few "peepee" puns. Imagine if Bin Laden had done his videos looking like the Cat-in-the-Hat or something: Totally not intimidating unless you're a crazy Twitter user.

Some might argue it reduces credibility. But those people need to take life a little less serious. You'll never make it out alive. Everybody poops & many scratch their ass. And some of them discuss serious things too.

I also might highlight that for 4 years so-called mature journalists, politicians, and others went on about supposed "peepee tape" blackmail on Trump. But, should some of those same people or their supporters like to attack my credibility and the "seriousness" of my analysis that's fine by me. I'm always open to being a punching bag to both expose hypocrisy and encourage people to make my real arguments for me.

Finally, as you may be aware, we now have drag queens & top-scar beavers on children's TV. They're coming for the minds of the youth. So maybe a bit of juvenile humor every now and then catches the eye of some young person and encourages them to take a closer look.

# 1.

## Look! A Book!

*"Is there an idea more radical in the history of the human race than turning your children over to total strangers whom you know nothing about and having those strangers work on your child's mind, out of your sight, for a period of twelve years? Could there be a more radical idea than that?"*

*--John Taylor Gatto*

The absolute best thing you can do to jumpstart any child's education is teaching them to read the most common words. If you can make the reading process less of a struggle, the skill will snowball and the world of the written word will become their inheritance.

Once a child can read, the biggest obstacle to learning is often not being motivated to know. Many of us can probably think of instances where we struggled to learn something and then some time later, armed with a compelling reason to learn, we then came back and easily picked it up.

*"...many of the people we consider "intellectuals" seem more to be "intellectualizing" where they take incorrect or hollow conclusions and support them with words that sound smart but have no depth or meaning."*

*--@[laochspiorad](#)*

It is easier to cover up poor ideas with audio or visual media than it is with plain writing. This is why making the reading process an easy & enjoyable one is one of the most important skillsets you can give to a child. There's also, I think, something magical about reading text (especially as most people read aloud in their minds) blurring the line between reader & writer in a way that video & audio interactions do not.

*"I feel sad that the brave new age of instant information didn't make things or us better. We may need to re-evolve as humanity before any of this makes any impact at all."*

*--@themorrigan1973*

The world is currently awash in books, articles, & other forms of analysis on national & regional issues. But the closer you get to home the less there is. There is certainly value in knowledge & discussion of larger issues, and some of them will end up impacting your local community. But many will not. How many millions end up transfixed by the story du jour which will never impact their lives? It used to be only occasionally a kid would fall down a well and captivate a nation. Now? It's non-stop.

*"As far as the mass of the people go, the extraordinary swings of opinion which occur nowadays, the emotions which can be turned on and off like a tap, are the result of newspaper and radio hypnosis."*

*--George Orwell*

For most of human history, the individual minds & personalities you interacted with were those that were in



your immediate physical surroundings. With the advent of forms of mass communication, from the written word on crude paper to the internet, we increasingly ceded that spotlight to faraway minds. How many children no longer look to their immediate elders for wisdom? How many find the contents of their minds, their acquired wisdom, is valued at near-zero by those others who surround them? What does this do to us as individuals and entire societies?

*“The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country. ...We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes formed, our ideas suggested, largely by men we have never heard of. This is a logical result of the way in which our democratic society is organized. Vast numbers of human beings must cooperate in this manner if they are to live together as a smoothly functioning society. ...In almost every act of our daily lives, whether in the sphere of politics or business, in our social conduct or our ethical thinking, we are dominated by the relatively small number of persons...who understand the mental processes and social patterns of the masses. It is they who pull the wires which control the public mind.”*

*--Edward Bernays*

We need to expand the creation of local culture. Every tool, trick, and tactic used here to engage with national or global issues can also be used to engage with local issues. Such engagement is also likely to have a greater impact at the local level.

*"It's easier to fool people than to convince them that they have been fooled."*

*--Mark Twain*

Whether you focus on local or national issues, if you're seeking to really help free #WeThePeople then monetary rewards may be hard to come by. But if you're ultimately building towards something massive, even if you don't know what it is yet, then the potential for non-monetary rewards increases dramatically.

*"If our society is founded on fictions, which it is, tearing them down only helps if we have a secure platform on which to land and bring others along with us."*

*--@themorrigan1973*

A book is a concentrated package of knowledge, wisdom, or information. A ebook is harder to censor than many other forms of modern information exchange. A social media account & its entire history created over years can be purged in an instant. A digital book on the other hand can be burned and then quickly reappear in its exact same form.

*"I think once we take away the right of free speech we may never get it back. My big concern...is who makes the decision, what speech is allowable and what is not?"*

*--Susan Bro*

That's the trouble with a book. The elite can never quite be sure it's gone. Maybe it's lurking out there in some dank, dark place. A fungus blooming and spreading among minds.

That's the kind of thing that drives the elite mad. It's what they really fear. And it's why they spend so much time & resources attempting to keep you dumb & docile.

*"Totalitarianism, if not fought against, could triumph anywhere."*

*--George Orwell*

A book can't be caged or killed. You can't bust down a book's door at 5am. You can't threaten a book's family. It can't get hit by a bus or have its heart give out after too many Krispy Kremes (or vaccines).

A book only requires a momentary internet connection and a tiny amount of data to spread far and wide. You could fill an average flash drive with thousands of them. A book is an attempt to make some sense of the world. A library allows an entire people to grow in wisdom. Or at least it should. It all depends on what you've got inside those walls, metaphorical or real. So let's start filling our libraries, digital & not, with local culture.

*"I am trying to save the world for my family"*

*--[@eucaliptus](#)*

The library is often better than the streets if you want to defeat the elites.

*"The hope for the twentieth century rests on recognition that war and depression are man-made, and needless. They can be avoided in the future by turning from the nineteenth-century characteristics just mentioned (materialism, selfishness, false values, hypocrisy, and secret vices) and going back*



*to other characteristics that our Western Society has always regarded as virtues: generosity, compassion, cooperation, rationality, and foresight, and finding an increased role in human life for love, spirituality, charity, and self-discipline."*

*--Carroll Quigley*

## 2.

# Everything Massive Once Wasn't

Propaganda is like a brick wall or a tile floor. You just need enough little pieces.

By embracing unreality as much as our society has, we have altered the understandings of how the world operates, what average people look, sound, and act like, how change is made, and more. Media portrayals have utterly transformed too many's interactions with one another. Inspiring monologues, impassioned pleas, stuff that sounds fantastic provided you don't do any digging or try to take into account the actual complex past or unknown possible futures. These are the types of nonsense that sway people throughout history, and yet our culture has amplified them and spread them to all corners of the globe to previously impossible levels.

Just as our current unreality was built, piece by piece, so too can we forge our new reality. It doesn't take grand acts. It doesn't require you to don warpaint and run around in the mud. Just find your section of wall and start at it. Devise a plan. Talk to your friends. Form an affinity group. Start small. Everything massive was once a single atom. It doesn't matter if someone way over there is doing it. We need you to do it too so if that someone over there falls you're still here going at it with your crew. Share ideas often. Work bigger when absolutely necessary.

Evolve. Iterate. You can do these things so much better in small groups. We need you to experiment. Let's figure out what works. We need to do it soon because the ruling elite

are CONVINCED they know what's best. And if we don't end up with a viable alternative...If we don't end up with something that is going to rally & unify enough people against it? Well Game Over people. There's no "Would you like to restart from a previous save?" prompt waiting for us. We're all out of quarters. The bars of The Final Cage would seem to all be in place. The only step remaining is to lure us inside and slide the door closed.

The melding of psychology, marketing, censorship, genetic modification, economics, etc into one all-encompassing religion were necessary to bring us to this point. And make no mistake, this is not simply about destroying your way of life as you previously knew it, this project will change all life as we know it. It is no exaggeration to say that these people wish to re-engineer humanity itself and they possess the hubris to believe that they can, and the ignorance to believe that they should.

Forcing changes to your beliefs are only just the beginning. Widespread acceptance of mRNA vaccines is simply the foot in the door, this technology has the potential to lead to an attempt at an entirely new evolutionary track for humans (and likely other "useful" species as well). We're hurtling towards what should be bright red lines. Yet far too many seem colorblind.

The elite actually want to make themselves physically different from you, not just symbolically different. That's their goal. Transhumanism. Technocracy. Especially the censorious and tyrannical Silicon Valley types. It's madness. It's suicidal folly.

If we allow ourselves to be lured into The Final Cage there will be no escape once that door slams shut. This would not be a setback, this would be the end.

But we know most people don't actually want this. They want a clean & stable place to raise their kids. They want to contribute to their communities. They want to be able to educate & express themselves uncensored. They don't want to be nitpicked and monitored and manipulated every waking moment of their day. Take away all the advertising and marketing and BS and people just want to lead simple, productive, peaceful lives.

So why the hell can't we figure out how to do that in 2021? It's not going to look like it did in 1776. But the tools of 1776 and it's aftermath still currently provide us all that we need to attempt to ascertain this. The elite are now clamoring to take away some of these tools. This is deeply concerning because there is one tool that they can never take away: The willingness of a person to sacrifice their life in pursuit of a noble goal.

An animal backed into a corner will bite. But this doesn't guarantee a good outcome for the animal.

### 3.

## Bill Gates & The COVID Crazies

We are still in the midst of one of the greatest instances of collective delusion ever seen. We are held hostage by fear of an invisible and everpresent enemy who has been imbued with characteristics more at home in the realms of serial killers and supernatural monsters.

***"One year ago, the entire non-thinking population of the planet—the people who walk through life without questioning much, viewing reality through a warped prism distorted by unimpressive cable news anchors of average intellect—banded together to do what they do best: take orders.***

***They're called the Branch Covidians, and as with all other cultists, it doesn't matter how many false prophecies are spewed by their leaders. In their own minds, they still manage to justify following the directions of the people in charge.***

...

***The Branch Covidian cult only differs from typical cults in one way: its leaders are remarkably uncharismatic. Unlike most cults, whose leaders have magnetic personalities, the Branch Covidians are led by losers who are too mundane and uninspiring to lead a knitting club. Perhaps that's a fortunate silver lining. If Dr. StrangeFlu had the personality of,***

***say, Bono, the Branch Covidians would be begging for even more ritual humiliation."***  
***[Source]***

Thank heavens that in our society the best do not generally rise to the top. With a more competent elite we might be in even more trouble than we already are. Instead we get a more bumbling group of fools, who while certainly dangerous and capable of inflicting great harms, are still inept enough to be comically impotent at times. But the path the past 12 months have put us on is certainly no laughing matter.

***"In this epidemic, the danger is not the coronavirus but the people who instrumentalise it and who are the real virus to fight."***

***The virus is completely innocent of what is happening (impoverishment, job losses, suicides, deaths, economic recession, unemployment, etc.) and the real culprits are those who have pushed the world to use these measures and the governments that continue to implement these measures despite alerts and warnings."*** ***[Source]***

Fear has been used as a tool of control by elites throughout history. Fear overpowers the logical mind. It makes people more malleable. A fearful people will accept & engage in behaviors an unafraid individual will not. Around the world, especially in the West, freedoms have been curtailed and authoritarian tendencies have been allowed to flourish.

***"New Zealand's Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern has urged obedient members of the public to***



***call out violators of coronavirus rules, as it emerged people have been concealing Covid-19 contacts.***

***Speaking on Monday about recent Covid-19 cases that are linked to breaches of anti-coronavirus restrictions, Ardern aimed mighty jabs at rule breakers.***

***"Even with the full understanding of human fallibility, it is not appropriate, and it is not okay for members of a team of five million to let the rest of us down."***

***Ruling out punishments for the violators handed out directly by the government, and citing the separation of police and state, the PM urged the public to take the matter into their own hands and "call out" any rule-breakers they spot, family and friends included.***

***"If there is any question mark right now over there being consequences, you know, those individuals are facing the full judgment of the entire nation. There are consequences, undoubtedly," Ardern stated." [\[Source\]](#)***

Even if these policies worked such rhetoric would be inexcusable. Even if these policies worked they would be unacceptable infringements upon human rights. But they do not work, which makes their implementation all the more odious.

***"The latest study to show the weakness of the pro-lockdown position appeared this month in the European Journal of Clinical Investigation,***

***authored by Eran Bendavid, Christopher Oh, Jay Bhattacharya, and John P.A. Ioannidis. Titled "Assessing Mandatory Stay-at-Home and Business Closure Effects on the Spread of COVID-19," the authors compare "more restrictive non-pharmaceutical interventions" (mrNPI) and "less restrictive non-pharmaceutical interventions" (lrNPI). More restrictive interventions include mandatory stay-at-home orders and forced business closures. Less restrictive measures include "social distancing guidelines, discouraging of international and domestic travel, and a ban on large gatherings." The researchers compare outcomes at the subnational level in a number of countries, including England, France, Germany, Iran, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, and the United States. This is then compared against countries with less restrictive measures, primarily Sweden and South Korea, where stay-at-home orders and business closures were not widely implemented.***

***The conclusion:***

***We find no clear, significant beneficial effect of mrNPIs on case growth in any country....In none of the 8 countries and in none out of the 16 comparisons (against Sweden or South Korea) were the effects of mrNPIs significantly negative (beneficial). The point estimates were positive (point in the direction of mrNPIs resulting in increased daily growth in cases)."***

***[\[Source\]](#)***

Lockdowns don't work. Nor do masks:

***"The CDC has admitted face masks do little to prevent the spread of COVID-19 amid mounting pressure to lift mask mandates across the U.S. In a new study, the CDC found face masks had a negligible impact on coronavirus numbers that didn't exceed statistical margins of error.***

...

***The CDC added it still recommends wearing face masks, although it admitted such mandates do not make any statistical difference. In the meantime, some states across the nation have slowly returned to normalcy by putting an end to mask mandates." [\[Source\]](#)***

The flaws & limitations of PCR testing are also ignored:

***"An important question that demands an answer is whether the experts at our federal health agencies and the World Health Organization were really too ignorant to understand the implications of using this test at excessive CT, or whether it was done on purpose to create the illusion of a dangerous, out-of-control pandemic.***

...

***A persistent sticking point with the PCR test is that it picks up dead viral debris, and by excessively magnifying those particles with CTs in the 40s, noninfectious individuals are labeled as infectious and told to self-isolate.***

***In short, media and public health officials have conflated “cases” — positive tests — with the actual illness.***

***Medically speaking, a “case” refers to a sick person. It never ever referred to someone who had no symptoms of illness. Now all of a sudden, this well-established medical term, “case,” has been arbitrarily redefined to mean someone who tested positive for the presence of noninfectious viral RNA.***

***The research is unequivocal when it comes to who’s infectious and who’s not. You cannot infect another person unless you carry live virus, and you typically will not develop symptoms unless your viral load is high enough.***

***As it pertains to PCR testing, when excessively high CTs are used, even a minute viral load that is too low to cause symptoms can register as positive. And, since the test cannot distinguish between live virus and dead viral debris, you may not even be carrying live virus at all.” [\[Source\]](#)***

A more technical analysis reveals even more flaws:

***“Many errors are presented by the ICSLS. The concentration of primers used in the development of the PCR tests are “far too high” for “optimal specific amplifications of target genes.” The variations of primer pairs used in the CD paper mean, “The design variations will inevitably lead to results that***

***are not even SARS CoV-2 related.” Thus, various laboratories could assume they have detected a positive COVID case, using a formula that does not actually detect COVID.***

***In order for a PCR test to be reliable, “amplification from 3 different genes (primers) of the virus under investigation is required.” Yet the ICSLS found in the CD paper that “in nearly all test procedures worldwide, merely 2 primer matches were used instead of all three. This oversight renders the entire test-protocol useless with regards to delivering accurate test-results of real significance in an ongoing pandemic.”***

***Continuing, the ICSLS notes that the proposed PCR test contains “severe design errors,” and since the test is unable to distinguish between “the whole virus and viral fragments” it “cannot be used as a diagnostic for SARS-viruses.” A positive test, as mentioned in the CD paper, cannot determine if one is infected with the virus, but “merely indicates the presence of viral RNA molecules.”***

***...***

***The proposed PCR tests also ignore the “essential scientific gold standard” which is to have a positive control and a negative control, by which to identify COVID-19 from other coronaviruses. Furthermore, the CD paper itself notes the gene used in the tests is not specific to COVID-19, and thus detects “a broad spectrum of other SARS viruses.”***

***[\[Source\]](#)***

RT has even created a ["Freedom Index"](#):

***"Our new Covid-19 Freedom Index will track the world's leading economies, and major territories within them, to see if they are restricting their citizens, either by limiting basic rights, such as freedom of movement, essential functions, like the ability to go to school or operate a business, or freedom from technological surveillance." [Source]***

In times of crisis (or perceived crisis) there is often little time or inclination to develop truly new plans and solutions. Instead, what usually occurs is that the ideas that are already available, the ones already developed & fleshed out, these are the ideas which are offered up and adopted as "solutions." This is why so much time, effort, and money is spent to engage in games of fantasy, like Event 201.

***"...a cabal of powerful individuals did indeed begin planning the mass eviction of vaccine skeptics from social media in October 2019, a week or two before COVID began circulating. That month, Microsoft founder Bill Gates organized an exercise of four "table-top" simulations of a worldwide coronavirus pandemic with other high-ranking "Deep State" panjandrums. The exercise was referred to as Event 201.***

***Gates' co-conspirators included representatives from the World Bank, the World Economic Forum (Great Reset), Bloomberg/Johns Hopkins University Populations Center, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, various media***



***powerhouses, the Chinese government, a former Central Intelligence Agency/National Security Agency director (there is no such thing as a former CIA officer), vaccine maker Johnson & Johnson, the finance and biosecurity industries and Edelman, the world's leading corporate PR firm.***

***At Gates' direction, these eminences roleplayed members of a Pandemic Control Council, wargaming government strategies for controlling the pandemic, the narrative and the population. Needless to say, there was little talk of building immune systems, off-the-shelf remedies or off-patent therapeutic drugs and vitamins, but lots of chatter about promoting uptake of new patentable antiviral drugs and vaccines.***

***But the participants primarily focused on planning industry-centric, fear-mongering, police-state strategies for managing an imaginary global coronavirus contagion culminating in mass censorship of social media." [\[Source\]](#)***

These simulations and conferences allow the elite to game out actions & responses, as well as network, to ensure the smoothest route to their goals. These goals are made easier to accomplish as the role of governments is increasingly outsourced, either officially or unofficially, to private organizations.

***"The common thread seen in the United States is the delegation of state policy to prediction modeling forecasts from the Institute for***

***Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME), a Washington State-based institution that is wholly controlled and funded (to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars) by The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.***

***In March and early April, politicians were informed by the modeling “experts” at Gates-funded IHME that their hospitals were about to be completely overrun by coronavirus patients. Modelers from IHME claimed this massive surge would cause hospitals to run out of lifesaving equipment in a matter of days, not weeks or months. Time was of the essence, and now was the time for rapid decision making, the modelers claimed.***

***...***

***These models, and the policy decisions that were made by relying on them, set off a chain of events that led to indefinite lockdowns, complete business closures, statewide curfews, and most infamously, the nursing home death warrants.***

***States across the nation went to extremes, resorting to full bunker mode while waiting for bodies to start dropping in the streets, but the IHME modeling never panned out. Hospital capacity was never threatened. Most states that had created “surge capacity” pop-up health care centers never even used these facilities. IHME, for its part, regularly “adjusts” its models, and has never acknowledged their routine failures to forecast outcomes.” [\[Source\]](#)***

Often these organizations have financial interests in the areas of policy which they advise:

***"An increasingly clear feature of the covid-19 pandemic is that the public health response is being driven not only by governments and multilateral institutions, such as the World Health Organisation, but also by a welter of public-private partnerships involving drug companies and private foundations.***

***...***

***Revelations of the Wellcome Trust's financial conflicts of interest follow news reports that another charity, the Gates Foundation, is also positioned to potentially benefit financially from its leading role in the pandemic response. An investigation by the Nation revealed that Gates had more than \$250m (£179m; €206m) invested in companies working on covid-19 and cited civil society groups expressing alarm with the outsize influence the billionaire charity wields in the pandemic response, which they see as elevating the role of the drug industry.***

***Yet charities such as Gates and Wellcome—and even drug companies—have generally been praised in the news media during the pandemic for their efforts to solve the public health crisis, with relatively little attention paid to their financial interests and with few checks and balances put on their work."***  
***[\[Source\]](#)***

However, making money in such a direct fashion is not the only way the elite seek to profit from crises:

***"Having squeezed every last drop of "value" from the earth, and with no more land to settle or markets to discover, capital's approaching apotheosis finds it looking for a lifeline by creating a virtual copy of itself, where intellectual property supplants physical property and human biological and behavioral processes are recast as a grotesque form of human labor.***

***Efforts are now underway to "translate" the real world into a digital counterfeit that can provide financial markets with the figures and statistics it needs to execute the contracts of the incipient human capital markets - an insidious new form of capital assembled from our genetic code and other kinds of data that will form the basis of a financialized wonderland, enforced by blockchain technology and constantly monitored and updated through the burgeoning biosecurity state.***

***Led by the world's most powerful hedge funds and transnational corporations, the so-called Great Reset amounts to little more than a campaign to turn humanity into datasets, which they can use to create more profits for themselves and their clients." [\[Source\]](#)***

Media manipulation & censorship is used heavily to advance elite goals. For example, how long was this storyline buried

by the mainstream press before it finally became so big that even they could not contain it:

***"According to the New York State Attorney General's Office, the N.Y. State Department of Health's published nursing home data "may have been undercounted by as much as 50 percent."***

***The Associated Press reported last May that the Cuomo administration mandated that more than 4,300 recovering COVID patients be sent back into nursing homes, despite the likelihood that some of those patients were still contagious and could spread the virus throughout the facilities." [\[Source\]](#)***

The media also aids in acts of intimidation:

***"So, within two weeks of The Guardian publishing a Gates-sponsored article calling for something to be done about President Magufuli, he has disappeared, allegedly due to Covid. Funny how that works out."***

***Even if Magufuli miraculously survives his bout of "suspected Covid19", the writing is on the wall for his political career. The Council on Foreign Relations published this article just yesterday, which goes to great lengths arguing that the President has lost all authority, and concludes:***

***"a bold figure within the ruling party could capitalize on the current episode to begin to reverse course."***

***It's not hard to read the subtext there, if you can even call it "subtext" at all.***

***...***

***Last summer Pierre Nkurunziza, the President of Burundi, refused to play along with Covid and instructed the WHO delegation to leave his country...before dying suddenly of a "heart attack" or "suspected Covid19". His successor immediately reversed every single one of his Covid policies, including inviting the WHO back to the country." [\[Source\]](#)***

Of course since the above was written we know that Magufuli did not survive his "heart problems".

Elite-friendly propaganda has gotten increasingly blatant:

***"In the last few weeks the media has demonstrated one of the clearest, most concise displays of true-life doublethink I've ever seen. It truly is the perfect exemplar.***

***The dichotomy is in "covid deaths" vs "vaccine related injuries".***

***As we all know by now, countries all around the world define "Covid deaths" as "people who die, of any cause, within 30 days of a positive test result" (the number of days changes by country, it's usually between 28 and 60). This trend was started in Italy last spring, and spread all around the world.***

***Globally, with a few notable exceptions, a "covid death" is a death "from any cause" following a positive test.***



...

***What's hilarious is those same journalists and "experts" preaching against "Covid denial", are now literally employing our own arguments against us in the name of defending the vaccines.***

...

***You see, it's important not take deaths out of context. After all, many of the people who die after being vaccinated are old and frail and already seriously ill. We need to be "careful about causation", just because event B happened after event A, does not mean A caused B to happen.***

***In other words: There is a difference between with and from." [\[Source\]](#)***

Or consider 5 ways the media & "experts" attempt to trick you into getting the vaccine:

### ***"1. Bribery***

...

***Important to remember: "Getting back to normal" is a lie. As much as people repeat the mantra in soundbites and social media posts, the "experts" are clearer - many have said we will NEVER be going back to normal, and others have said we need to maintain anti-Covid measures until at least 2022. The "vaccine" itself does not even claim to limit transmission, even those vaccinated are still being ordered to follow the restrictions.***

## **2. Celebrity Endorsements**

...

***Important to remember: Celebrities - especially actors and TV personalities - are simply paid to repeat lines. Even if their intentions are correct, there's no reason to assume any of them have any understanding of what they're talking about. And none of these people has anything to lose should you or a loved one suffer any harm from taking an untested vaccine.***

## **3. Forced "scarcity"**

...

***Important to remember: It's all total nonsense. They are not in any danger of "running out" of vaccines. And even if they are, scarcity is a marketing ploy, not an argument.***

## **4. Fake "popularity"**

...

***Important to remember: An opinion poll is no measure of reality, popularity is no measure of quality, and it is in the establishment's interest to make all dissenters feel they are in a tiny minority.***

## **"5. Resistance is useless"**

...

***Important to remember: vaccine passports will only ever become "inevitable" once the vast***

***majority of people have had the vaccine. If enough people refuse to take part, the program will never work." [\[Source\]](#)***

Do not be mistaken, this is no ordinary vaccine, even though those too have potentially grave issues. Instead this is an entirely new technology.

***"Studies of licensed vaccines have identified many problems with these secondary ingredients — adjuvants like aluminum, preservatives like thimerosal and stabilizers like gelatin — not to mention highlighting the presence in vaccines of residual DNA from cell lines used in the manufacturing process as well as disclosed and undisclosed contaminants.***

***With the advent of three experimental COVID injections approved for emergency use in the U.S., manufacturers have introduced new primary ingredients to the U.S. vaccine stage — messenger RNA (mRNA) in the Pfizer and Moderna injections and an adenovirus vector in the Johnson & Johnson (J&J) injection.***

***Not only that, but vaccine makers have bundled these new primary ingredients with “inactive” excipients in unprecedented ways — polyethylene glycol (PEG) in the case of the mRNA vaccines and polysorbate 80 in the J&J shot." [\[Source\]](#)***

But don't just take my word for it, here's Tal Zaks:

***"...Moderna's “top scientist,” Dr. Tal Zaks, said the firm's mRNA technology in use for***

***covid mass-jabbing is “hacking the software of life.”***

***He revealed the above on a 2017 talk show, saying that for over the past 30 years:***

***“(W)e’ve been living this phenomenal digital scientific revolution, and I’m here today to tell you, that we are actually hacking the software of life, and that it’s changing the way we think about prevention and treatment of disease,” adding:***

***“In every cell there’s this thing called messenger RNA or mRNA for short, that transmits the critical information from the DNA in our genes to the protein, which is really the stuff we’re all made out of.”***

***“This is the critical information that determines what the cell will do.”***

***“So we think about it as an operating system” — that irreversibly alters human DNA with unknown, potentially devastating consequences.***

***“So if you could change that, if you could introduce a line of code, or change a line of code, it turns out, that has profound implications for everything, from the flu to cancer.”” [\[Source\]](#)***

Some argue that the new vaccines do not even meet the definition of "vaccine". Their arguments seem to rest on solid foundations (for now):

***"...According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, a vaccine is:***

***"A product that stimulates a person's immune system to produce immunity to a specific disease, protecting the person from that disease."***

***Immunity, in turn, is defined as:***

***"Protection from an infectious disease," meaning that "If you are immune to a disease, you can be exposed to it without becoming infected."***

***That's the medical definition. The legal definition, in the few cases where it has been detailed, is equally unequivocal:***

***--Iowa code2 — "Vaccine means a specially prepared antigen administered to a person for the purpose of providing immunity."***

***--Washington state code — "Vaccine means a preparation of a killed or attenuated living microorganism, or fraction thereof ..." The statute also specifies that a vaccine "upon immunization stimulates immunity that protects us against disease ..."***

***These definitions, both medical and legal, present problems for mRNA "vaccines," since:***

***--mRNA injections do not impart immunity. Moderna and Pfizer both admit that their clinical trials aren't even looking at immunity.***

***As such they do not fulfill the medical and/or legal definition of a vaccine.***

***--They do not inhibit transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 infection. As such they do not fulfill the medical and/or legal definition of a vaccine."***  
***[\[Source\]](#)***

With increasing frequency however, dictionaries have become Orwellian tools, redefining terms based on the fads of the day:

***"...As of February 2019, Merriam-Webster defined "vaccine" as "a preparation of killed microorganisms, living attenuated organisms, or living fully virulent organisms that is administered to produce or artificially increase immunity to a particular disease." By February 26, 2021, they had updated the definition of "vaccine" to:***

***"A preparation that is administered (as by injection) to stimulate the body's immune response against a specific infectious disease:***

***a: an antigenic preparation of a typically inactivated or attenuated ... pathogenic agent (such as a bacterium or virus) or one of its components or products (such as a protein or toxin)***

***b: a preparation of genetic material (such as a strand of synthesized messenger RNA) that is used by the cells of the body to produce an antigenic substance (such as a fragment of virus spike protein)"" [\[Source\]](#)***



As argued above, these "vaccines" do not meet the medical or legal definition of vaccines. Instead, it would be more accurate to describe them as a "gene therapy":

***"...here's how the U.S. Food and Drug Administration defines gene therapy:***

***"Human gene therapy seeks to modify or manipulate the expression of a gene or to alter the biological properties of living cells for therapeutic use. Gene therapy is a technique that modifies a person's genes to treat or cure disease. Gene therapies can work by several mechanisms:***

***--Replacing a disease-causing gene with a healthy copy of the gene***

***--Inactivating a disease-causing gene that is not functioning properly***

***--Introducing a new or modified gene into the body to help treat a disease"" [\[Source\]](#)***

Not only are the "vaccines" likely a gene therapy, they are an experimental one at that.

Due to the extensive media & "expert" misinformation campaigns, it can be reasonably argued that the principle of informed consent is being violated.

***"Covid mortality is a reflection of increased mortality with age, more so than influenza/pneumonia of previous years. The median age of Covid deaths (86) exceeds average life expectancy in Canada. Tragically, 70% of the deaths in the province of Ontario***

***took place in care homes. The mortality rate from Covid in Canada under 59 years of age is 0.0017%.***

***According to the CDC, the survival from Covid (with inflated stats) is as follows: (under 20) 99.997%, (29-49) 99.98%, (50-69) 99.5% and (over 70), 94.6%.***

***...***

***To exercise informed consent, any recipient of this SGT must be made aware that they are now participating in a clinical trial. There is no claim about reduction of transmission. All risk-benefit analysis must be focused on the individual, as is treatment with a drug therapy.***

***Therefore, the potential trial recipient must understand IFR, the absolute risk reduction in symptoms, and potential side effects, including ADE as well as efficacious alternatives for treatment if the need arises.***

***If the potential trial subject is not relayed this information, or does not comprehend the information, it is a blatant violation of Nuremberg code.***

***The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential...This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other***

***ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision.***

***This latter element requires that before the acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experimental subject there should be made known to him the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health or person which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment."*** [\[Source\]](#)

So, if you're trying to decide for yourself (or help someone else decide) whether to take the vaccine, these 5 questions may be useful:

- ***"Did you know that we have NEVER successfully vaccinated against ANY coronavirus?***
- ***Did you know it usually takes 5-10 years to fully develop a vaccine?***
- ***Did you know that the Covid "vaccine" is based on new technology, which has never been approved for use on humans before?***
- ***Did you know that the pharmaceutical companies can't be sued if the vaccine hurts or kills someone?***

- ***Did you know 99.8% of people survive Covid19?"***

***[\[Source\]](#)***

You will also want to consider reports of whistleblowers like this:

***"James reports that in 2020 very few residents in the nursing home where he works got sick with COVID, and none of them died during the entire year of 2020.***

***However, shortly after administering the Pfizer experimental mRNA injections, 14 died within two weeks, and he reports that many others are near death." [\[Source\]](#)***

An analysis of the history of these pharmaceutical companies would be the bare minimum of due diligence on the mainstream media's part. Yet they fail to clear even this low bar as information like the excerpt below will not be found in their pages or on their programs:

***"As one of the world's leading medical device companies, J&J has had its share of recalls for faulty products including contact lenses and hip implants In 2013, it paid nearly \$2.5 billion to compensate 8,000 recipients for its flawed hip implants Again in 2016, another \$1 billion was awarded to plaintiffs injured from this device.***

***One particular dubious activity the company became involved with in 2008 was to launch a "phantom recall." When its Motrin IB caplets were discovered to not properly dissolve, it***

***hired outside contractors to buy up store supplies in order to avoid making public declaration. No one would have known of this activity and it would have gotten past the eyes of FDA inspectors had the deception not been exposed during a Congressional investigation.***

***...***

***...we might ask why a 140 year old company, with no history whatsoever in vaccine development, has now become among the heroes in the immunological war against Covid-19? J&J is not a household name in the vaccine industry. It is utterly absent, let alone ranks among the world's 20 major vaccine makers. Among the 53 vaccines for other infections approved and licensed by the CDC, not one is manufactured by the nation's leader in mouthwash and baby powder. It is therefore no surprise that the company had to partner with Merck to manufacture its Covid vaccine to meet demand. It has no history or expertise in this medical field.***

***...***

***...How is it that a drug and household health product company, with no prior history in vaccine development, can develop and rush to market its first vaccine against a viral strain that was only identified 14 months ago? Developing a vaccine requires many years and necessitates the establishment of an R&D infrastructure vastly different than conventional drug development. The other major companies developing Covid-19***

***vaccines have been in the business for decades. But not J&J. There is something more to this story that demands investigation. And if the company's long rap sheet offers any warning, it is that we must be wary of any claims J&J publicly states about the efficacy and safety of its products. Especially when the pandemic promise to increase the profits of numerous shareholders."*** [\[Source\]](#)

Despite all these valid criticisms & concerns, it is full speed ahead with the vaccination campaign, which must not be stopped at any cost. Of course, the media is not alone in pushing their falsehoods. Individuals in positions of authority across industries and governments have gotten in on the action. For example, consider the case of Lt. Gen. Dorothy A. Hogg's speaking about COVID vaccine safety at a Texas Air Force base:

***"But by far the most inexcusable part of Hogg's presentation, which neither upholds the ethics of "Do No Harm" with pregnant women nor follows informed consent guidelines, is that a general officer is using her position with undue influence, patriotic coercion and emotional manipulation to persuade airmen that it is their duty to participate in a Phase 3 clinical trial of an experimental medical intervention:***

***"Those of us in uniforms have taken oath to protect the country against all enemies. But this virus isn't just a threat to our country but to the world. It's our duty to do everything possible to protect not just ourselves, but our fellow countrymen. I encourage you to make***

***the best educated decision for yourself and for your family. A choice is yours if you choose to decline. But change your mind later, we're standing by to vaccinate you when you are ready. Our goal is to simply give you the information to make an informed decision. This is our shot to save our loved ones, friends and family. The more people that get vaccinated, the safer we are. Choosing to vaccinate protects your community, your unit, your mission and, most importantly, your family. What choices will you make to help get back to normal?"*** [\[Source\]](#)

The US military can't yet force its members to take the vaccine. In the meantime expect them to continue to their propaganda efforts to gain "voluntary" compliance. This despite surveys indicating a large percentage of individuals do not wish to take the vaccine, like this one:

***"A survey conducted in December 2020 by the Blue Star Families, a non-profit military advocacy organization, found that 53 percent of U.S. military families do not want to get the experimental COVID-19 vaccines being distributed under an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) granted by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA).***

***Of the of 53 percent of military families who responded to the survey indicating that they would not get the vaccine, nearly three-quarters cited a distrust of the development process or timeline."*** [\[Source\]](#)

Biden now plans to launch a campaign to reach vaccine-hesitant groups:

***"Set to kick off in the coming weeks, the White House will spend money on television, radio and digital advertising across a multitude of platforms to combat any skepticism Americans may have about getting the shot. The ultimate goal of the campaign: get people vaccinated as quickly as possible. According to Stat News, Congress and the Biden administration have set aside over \$1.5 billion to carry out their plan.***

***During a call with Newsmax, Biden aides said conservatives are one of the target groups. They said they have realized that the government isn't always the best messenger. So, the Biden administration is using the campaign to turn factual information provided by government agencies — including Health and Human Services, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other public health agencies — to other outlets and organizations that people may be more inclined to trust.***

***...***

***The Biden administration is looking to see trusted on-air talent talk about their vaccine experience, and even get one live on air. The administration is partnering with outlets to hold town-hall style events where viewers can ask experts questions and address any misinformation.***



***The Biden aides describe the planned approach as both a paid media outreach and grassroots effort. At the end of the day, they are hoping to create an opportunity for people to receive the information they need to make an educated decision about receiving a vaccine." [\[Source\]](#)***

The French have adopted a similar posture with their healthcare workers, perhaps with a bit more stick:

***"The French government has said that the level of Covid-19 vaccine uptake among those working in healthcare settings "is not acceptable" and said it could make the jab compulsory if vaccination rates don't improve.***

***"For the last year our health workers have been heroic, but the vaccination rate among them today is not acceptable," Gabriel Attal, the government spokesman, told Le Parisien newspaper on Sunday.***

...

***Attal added that the government would continue to encourage those working in healthcare settings to come forward and get the jab but, if that didn't work, making it obligatory "remains a possibility."" [\[Source\]](#)***

Nevermind the increasing number of reports of deadly side-effects:

***"Denmark's health authority has confirmed the country is extending the temporary suspension of the use of the AstraZeneca***

***Covid vaccine for three more weeks, as it can't rule out a connection between the jab and blood clots.***

***Speaking at a press conference, the Danish Medicines Agency's acting director of pharmacovigilance, Tanja Erichsen, said health officials were extending the prohibition on the use of the AstraZeneca vaccine over concerns about "presumed side effects".***

***...***

***"It can't be ruled out that there is a connection between the vaccine and the very rare blood clot cases," Erichsen said, warning that these are not "ordinary blood clots".***  
***[\[Source\]](#)***

The mainstream media elevates & amplifies experts which preach certainty, not caution. You won't find the following interview statements at an outlet like CNN or NYT:

***"Today, we are nowhere near possessing knowledge that is beyond reasonable doubt concerning infectious viral diseases like COVID-19. Yet, as draconian public health mitigation measures are imposed on society with little proof of effectiveness, and much proof of collateral damage, there is little debate covered in the commercial media about public health issues. In my opinion, public health officials and politicians are under pressure to do something to protect the public, even if they have no idea what actually works. They see an open debate in the media***

***as something that weakens their power and control.***

***...***

***People can't depend solely on the "approved" experts to tell them if the evidence is sufficient or not. We have so-called public health experts already telling us that now and look at the results. Experts from all sides must be given a fair hearing to present their case to the public and defend their case against the cases presented by other experts. It may be that pieces of evidence must be synthesized together from many sources to arrive at the final truth. That is the method I use to conduct my research. I look for pieces of evidence from a variety of research literature to synthesize together into a logical explanation or evidence-based theory...If someone else presents additional evidence that refutes or proves my theory wrong, then everyone benefits and scientific knowledge advances.***

***...***

***The reduced risk of COVID-19 infection reported by the manufacturers is approximately 95%, which is an accurate relative risk reduction measure. However, missing from the vaccine reports are absolute risk reduction measures which are much more clinically relevant to the reduced risk of COVID-19 infection. The absolute risk reduction of the vaccines in the present critical appraisal is approximately 1%, indicating practically no clinical efficacy or***

***usefulness of the vaccines to reduce COVID-19 infection.***

***...***

***Some people may point out that 1% of a million vaccinated people are still 10,000 prevented symptomatic infections. Fair enough; then report a 1% reduction and see how many people are still interested in getting the vaccine. Furthermore, there is no reliable evidence that even a reported 1% reduction is valid. For example, normal saline solutions used in the placebo groups are associated with fevers and other symptoms common to coronavirus infections. The credibility of the entire enterprise is compromised.***

***...***

***This type of outcome reporting bias violates the public's legal and ethical right to informed consent about the true efficacy of the vaccines. Regardless if you are pro-vax or anti-vax or are undecided, you have a right to all the facts to inform your personal opinion and choice. Bottomline: you have before you smoking-gun evidence of a huge public health scandal — if the word ever gets out! This problem has been ongoing for decades and really took off when the pharmaceutical companies were granted permission to advertise directly to consumers in the 1980s. Think of all the systematic reviews of clinical trials that could be compromised by this type of clinical trial outcome reporting bias."***

***[\[Source\]](#)***

We do not know what the long term effects of these "vaccines" will be. Their clinical studies are not even due to be completed for years. Meanwhile, hundreds of millions, if not billions, will be injected with experimental cocktails. And Big Pharma is showing no signs of slowing down:

***"“Every year, you need to go to get your flu vaccine,” Bourla [CEO, Pfizer] said. “It’s going to be the same with COVID. In a year, you will have to go and get your annual shot for Covid to be protected,” Bourla told NBC News.”***  
***[\[Source\]](#)***

I won't be taking this "vaccine" this year, next year, or any year after that. I recommend you don't either. Your life is too important to waste by being Big Pharma's guinea pig. But don't take my word for it: Do your own research.

## 4.

# Nullifying the Elite

Americans have become apathetic. The tendrils of the federal government are wrapped around every state. And those same state governments are often complicit in breaching the rights of their citizens. The Supreme Court has too much power and clearly has no interest in using it to benefit average Americans. Worldwide, elites are wresting more and more control from We the People.

***"...the dark forces of the Global Cabal, the Deep State, has plunged humanity - all 193 UN member states at once, into a global catastrophe of epic proportions. To break that globalist spell and to get out of the disaster still unfolding, the world needs thinking people, courageous people, informed and awakened people; people who are not afraid to swim against the stream, to stem the ever-increasing flow of misinformation and government and media lies. It takes educated people. It takes people who dare to resist.***

***We are experiencing today just the contrary. The minute global elite that has taken a covid-stranglehold on the world's 7.8 billion people, is doing everything to keep our children, the generations that are supposed to lead the world and humanity into a bright future, uneducated, scared, socially unfit to communicate, to take initiatives, to lead. Today's youth is depressed by this constant***

***fear propaganda, by the authorities (sic) rules of confinement, not being able to see their friends, to play with them, communicate with them, to do the healthiest social activities there are - exchanging ideas with peers, acquaintances and friends."* [\[Source\]](#)**

In recent years a group of people has increasingly realized that reality as stated by the loudest voices in the room is starkly different than reality as they perceive it. The louder and more forcefully they are told they are wrong, the more angry and/or confused they get. This makes them vulnerable to charlatans & grifters or simply ineffectively lashing out at the bullies.

But we've now reached the point where even to attempt an honest analysis and develop an effective plan of action will have you labeled a domestic terrorist or insurrectionist. Because that analysis & plan is most certainly going to be at odds with the interest of the ruling elite who are currently consolidating power. This makes it that much more likely that only the wrong people will be willing to stand up.

However, stand up we must. We need leadership which seeks to free the minds of the people, not someone who desires to sedate them with their own brand of soma. Leadership which enables & encourages criticism of those in positions of leadership is the only way forward. All other paths lead into the Final Cage.

***"The U.S. military uses a concept called "defense-in-depth" as its primary defensive strategy. Defense-in-depth is a layered, multi-domain approach that uses numerous defensive elements designed to delay and diffuse the advance of an attacker. Rather***

***than relying on a single, strong defensive line, the defender wears down the enemy, causing casualties while deliberately yielding space. Once the enemy has lost momentum and is under stress, the defender mounts a decisive counterattack to destroy the enemy or drive them back to their original lines.***

***This strategy also works in the political world and is relevant to our current situation. An effective political defense-in-depth strategy should include all mechanisms of political action to wear down the attack on our republic, its culture, and the Constitution. The term political action isn't just limited to casting a vote or sending money to a political party. Effective political actions include protests, general strikes, walk-outs, sick-outs, civil disobedience, lawfare, and nullification."***

***...***

***In asymmetric political warfare [you are here], the weaker party wins by not losing. Its greatest strength is its ability to endure. The goal is to wear down the stronger party and use its own inefficiencies and weaknesses against it. The weaker party chooses the ground to fight on and avoids being drawn into a fixed battle. That means avoiding armed conflict unless the conditions for victory are ensured. This is the same strategy our enemies effectively used against us in Vietnam, Iraq, and Afghanistan." [\[Source\]](#)***

Those conflicts are all arguably a result of the Cold War and it's elite-friendly rhetoric. This rhetoric has poisoned the



minds of generations of Americans. It is yet another wedge shoved into what should be a unified mass against elite oppression.

***"Relentless Cold War rhetoric accomplished a near total indoctrination of our entire US culture.***

***Religious institutions, academic and educational institutions from kindergarten through graduate school, professional associations, political associations from local to national, scientific community, economic system, entertainment industry from radio and TV to Hollywood and sports, fraternal organizations, boy scouts, etc.—all systematically colluded and cooperated to preserve unquestioning belief in the unique nobility of the US American system while instilling pathological, rabid, paranoid fear of “enemies”— in our midst as well as “out there”—in order to rationalize otherwise pathologically inexplicable behavior around the world as well as at home.***

***The atrocities committed in the name of defeating communist bogeymen are nearly beyond belief...." [\[Source\]](#)***

Elites play the long game. You've been taught that things like 5-year plans are the tools of commie dictators and authoritarian countries but our elites make plans with far longer timeframes. They're organized. They know how to make small changes add up to something massive.

***"We arrived in our current situation because our ruling elites painstakingly prepared the battleground in advance. In 2012, they amended the 1948 Smith-Mundt Act to permit the domestic dissemination of government propaganda into American newsfeeds.***

***In 2015, they passed the Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) Act, which created a cottage industry of government-funded, progressive-leaning CVE consultants and think tanks dedicated to pushing the myth of right-wing "domestic extremism" and "white supremacy." Employing teachers, healthcare professionals, first responders, and community leaders, the Obama-era CVE mania built a federally controlled and funded local surveillance and intelligence collection apparatus that spans from grade schools to the workplace to the doctor's office. An apparatus that still uses debunked pseudoscience to classify ordinary Americans' constitutionally protected speech and activities as "pre-terrorism indicators."***

***Under the pretext of keeping us safe, they passed multiple counterterrorism laws such as the 2001 USA Patriot Act, the 2015 USA Freedom Act, and the various FISA Amendment Acts (2008, 2017, 2018, 2020), which, taken together, authorize warrantless mass surveillance of all American's communications, activities, associations, and business transactions.***

***...***

***We are locked in a zero-sum game rebellion of the elites, who are intent on fundamentally transforming America into an authoritarian state with a single ideology and ruling class.***

***In order to defeat this rebellion, we need to understand the terrain we are operating on and the strategy and tactics of our enemy. Even more important, we need a strategy of our own to guide our struggle and return to a functional representative government, bounded by the Constitution with the power fully vested in the people. Only a few decades ago, American politics was driven by shared interests of prosperity and well-being aligned with a free constitutional republic. We need to drive from the American consciousness the current docile acceptance of the fact that America has a ruling class—or a ruling elite—and we must banish these terms to the trash heap of racial epithets and aristocratic garbage. [\[Source\]](#)***

I think we have a very big problem. The professionalization of everything has led to an increasingly small portion of people in possession of the knowledge and skills required to make a modern, populous country function. The rest have been relegated to servicing the few that get to do the interesting work while also ingesting immense amounts of propaganda designed to keep them dumb & docile.

The professionalization of everything has also led to a precarity that increases the likelihood that even those who are more aware will do nothing. Gone are the days of individuals growing much of their own food and making many of their necessities. Also gone are the days where you

might have procured those things from others in your community. For many their very survival, day to day, depends on powerful institutions.

This combination of propaganda & precarity are absolutely toxic to the continuation of a free society. It increases the chances that bad actors can use force, manipulation, and intimidation to coerce enough into giving them what they want.

***"The denial of tragedy inevitably results in the denial of what makes us human, snipping the invisible thread that connects us to the lives of other people and draining the individual of moral gravity. It's no wonder, really, that Jordan Peterson's lectures on confronting our inner demons and cleaning one's room quickly became so popular, in contrast to prevailing narratives that portray those demons as some political or cultural identity group which must be externally vanquished.***

***Likewise, an impulse has emerged across the political spectrum—from woke to MAGA—that attributes any undesirable outcome in the world to some nefarious individual or group that must be righteously inveighed against, and anyone who exercises constraint or expresses doubt is stigmatized as a traitor, a phony progressive, RINO, Uncle Tom, corporate shill, or whatever else. Society's problems are understood as the product of bad intentions and bad people, who are conveniently imagined to be whichever politicized stereotype or caricature happens to irritate us the most—the redneck or the***

***hippie, the globalist or the capitalist, the black hoodlum or the white racist. The obvious and parsimonious answers to the problems we face (that we are experiencing entropy like every society in history) are exchanged for self-satisfying conspiracy theories which accelerate our decline. The breakdown of mutually agreed-upon reality gives way to zero-sum narrative warfare between political and cultural tribes with each narrative providing such meaning and identity to its believers that you can't get a damn word in about anything meaningful or interesting without offending the sensibilities of someone nearby. This is politics as salvation; the absence of tragedy. The upshot is that nothing gets done while the public grows increasingly bitter and resentful."*** [\[Source\]](#)

Many attempts at asking the government to cease its tyranny may in fact be attempts to stir the masses into action by making it clear that the government is lying, hypocritical, or acting in tyrannical ways. This seems useless to many individuals who pay more attention already and are intimately familiar with the abuses of the government (past & present) but this position ignores what the experience of being thoroughly propagandized feels like. The thoroughly propagandized feel as certain as "free-thinkers" do that they understand "reality".

Developing ways to remove the precarity might be our best bet moving forward as that may be the bigger driver of inaction for many. It's also harder to do. Fighting propaganda is easier to do these days than in the past, but removing precarity still largely requires dirty, hands-on, physical labor.

Nullification is a tool whose use can embolden the masses and inspire them to engage in more of that necessary, physical work. Many individuals loved Trump because he would verbally attack the enemies of the people. This endeared him to so many of the downtrodden masses. A state using its resources to shield its citizens from the fist of the federal government would do the same.

***"For the first nearly 90 years of the United States, from the Founding to the Civil War, individual states regularly asserted the right of nullification. This widely misunderstood principle did not allow states to violate the Constitution—exactly the opposite: It protected states from the federal government violating the Constitution, by allowing states to invalidate unconstitutional federal laws. In other words, the question of what was constitutional and what wasn't was decided by the states, not the Supreme Court.***

...

***You might argue that there is no basis for allowing states to decide what is constitutional. But there is less basis for allowing the Supreme Court to decide: Judicial review was invented out of whole cloth by the Supreme Court itself. Nullification cases always end up in federal court, where they lose—and why wouldn't they? To ask the Supreme Court to decide on nullification would be like asking Joe Biden whether he should be president."*** [\[Source\]](#)

We the People are the ultimate check on federal tyranny. And we can use the tool of our state governments to do our

duty to stop it. Our federal elites, like all elites, are a threat to all free peoples.

***"Completely detached from their own nations, imbued with a global liberal ideology and driven by the desire to accumulate wealth regardless of the consequences, Western elites have become antagonistic to their own citizens whose physical existence and spiritual heritage is unreservedly sacrificed for narrow economic interests and ideological views. The reaction of the other side is expectedly negative, but slow, given that social engineering within Western countries has been conducted since the end of World War II." [Source]***

If Congress believed they were representing and acting in the interests of average Americans they'd be fine with meeting in a stadium surrounded by tens of thousands of unscreened citizens. But as their reaction to January 6th shows, they intend to proceed in exactly the opposite direction. This is an illegitimate government.

***"The government derives its legitimacy from the consent of the governed. Nullification essentially withdraws that consent. In practice, nullification is a state (or locality) choosing to not comply with federal diktats, edicts, and laws. It is effective because a state—a collective political body with its own law-making authority, tax revenues, and consent of its own governed—is harder for the federal system to crush than an individual citizen is."***

***Nullification as a defensive measure provides citizens with relief from unconstitutional edicts and breathing room to develop and sustain the political movements required to make effective changes in the local-state-federal governing relationship." [\[Source\]](#)***

It's time we began to use tools & institutions a bit closer to home to protect ourselves and our communities from the tyrants who have illegitimately seized power. These are also the same tools & institutions which will be more beneficial to you and your family should the elite stoked divisions lead to even more instability & strife in the years ahead.



## 5.

### Escaping the Cul-de-sac

***"The infant child places an innate trust in those it finds itself with...The infant could not survive otherwise.***

***In a sane and healthy society, this deep instinct would evolve as the psyche developed. As self-awareness, the cognitive and reasoning abilities and scepticism evolved in the individual, this innate trust impulse would continue to be understood as a central need of the psyche. Shared belief systems would exist to consciously evolve and develop this childish impulse in order to place this faith somewhere consciously - in values and beliefs of lasting meaning and worth to the society, the individual, or, ideally, both.***

***...***

***What occurs when there is a childish need within us which has never evolved beyond its original survival function of trusting those in our environment who are, simply, the most powerful; the most present and active? When we have never truly explored our own psyches, and deeply interrogated what we truly believe and why? When our motivation for trusting anything or anyone goes unchallenged? When philosophy is left to the philosophers?***

***I suggest the answer is simple, and that the evidence of this phenomenon and the havoc it is wreaking is all around us: the innate impulse to trust the mother never evolves, never encounters and engages with its counterbalance of reason (or mature faith), and remains forever on its 'default' infant setting." [\[Source\]](#)***

The common enemy we face is not Socialism or Communism, it is Totalitarianism. In the past we have incorrectly labeled it Socialism or Communism but we cannot make the same mistake again. What is being pushed for is not something which seeks to help the masses, it does not seek to raise all of us up using our collective abilities. Instead, it seeks to divide us, to pit us against one another, and to keep us ignorant while the elite feast upon our collective wealth.

The Totalitarian regime currently seeking to consolidate its power possesses the most powerful tools of violence and manipulation in history. If they succeed they are the first one capable of implementing an erasure of the historical record at this scope & scale. It will devour the Socialists and the Communist too, eventually. And so we cannot further divide ourselves. The Totalitarian elite is our common enemy.

The bars of The Final Cage would seem to all be in place. The only step remaining is to lure us inside and slide the door closed. The melding of psychology, marketing, censorship, genetic modification, economics, etc into one all-encompassing religion were necessary to bring us to this point. And make no mistake, this is not simply about destroying your way of life as you previously knew it, this project will change all life as we know it. It is no exaggeration to say that these people wish to re-engineer

humanity itself and they possess the hubris to believe that they can, and the ignorance to believe that they should.

*"We don't know enough to play with the vehicle that made life. We're not that intelligent, not by a long shot."*

[--@themorrigan1973](#)

Forcing changes to your beliefs are only just the beginning. Widespread acceptance of mRNA vaccines is simply the foot in the door, this technology has the potential to lead to an attempt at an entirely new evolutionary track for humans (and likely other "useful" species as well). We're hurtling towards what should be bright red lines. Yet far too many seem colorblind.

The elite actually want to make themselves physically different from you, not just symbolically different. That's their goal. Especially the censorious and tyrannical Silicon Valley types. It's madness. It's suicidal folly. If we allow ourselves to be lured into The Final Cage there will be no escape once that door slams shut. This would not be a setback, this would be the end.

People's humanity is tethered to people, places, and things. Take away enough of them and you will take the humanity as well. Our current society has reached a dead end. Transhumanism seeks one path out of the cul-de-sac which would end Homo Sapiens. It's important that those who reject such a path develop viable alternatives or the current societal inertia will simply choose Transhumanism by default.

And while a backlash to such overreach is certainly a plausible outcome we would be wise to remember that any

backlash requires active participation. History is littered with instances of overreach which met insufficient resistance, resulting in truly dark periods. Our enemy possesses truly terrifying weapons of manipulation and control. Underestimate them at your (and our) peril.

If a second Civil War is fought, it too will pit a group of people seeking absolute control over others against those that reject such barbarity. Unfortunately, it too is likely to see the bodies and minds of the poor & working class used to advance causes that go against their interests. Just as occurs on a daily basis today.

I'm not sure what the correct label is, "capitalism" may not be it, but I think whatever you want to call the system which has spent most people's entire lives bathing them in propaganda designed to make & keep them dumb & docile consumers...well I think that system deserves at least a little blame for people's poor choices. Not all of it mind you, but certainly a non-zero amount, I think.

All of us critics of the status quo would be wise to remember: There's no undeniably, totally good time in American history to go back to. All periods of our history have been flawed in some way. But we are more than just our flaws. There are values we could again cherish, even if they were imperfectly expressed.

Criticizing an existing system and developing a new one require fairly different skill sets. There's certainly some overlap but much does not. So critics of capitalism will often just pick up whatever alternative system is lying around and say they're "for" that one. Critics of communism will often do the same.

But they're all flawed ideologies that end up empowering a tiny group of elites. The sooner enough of us recognize this the sooner we can begin working collectively to develop something that actually can work for average people. I've got a hunch that "something" will look nothing like Capitalism or Communism as we know them today.

I think perhaps the most difficult issue we face is how to properly deal with people who seek to gain power over others. How much of our existing government structures are really just centered around this goal? Though of course often they become (or sometimes are from their inception) tools of oppression themselves.

It seems that we have repeatedly failed throughout history, in this country and others, to properly scale our communities up from the simple tribe. Every seemingly necessary more complex social construct ends up twisted and perverted. As time passes we even forget what particular pieces of the social construct are even "for."

In some sense, once we got beyond our small tribes culture has always been used by the elite for control. I think now that we exist in a globally-connected society it becomes both clearer and more dangerous: We no longer have the buffers of distance and slow communications. Bad ideas spread faster and faster. Unfortunately the speed of analyzing bad ideas has not necessarily increased in tandem.

Such a task would, I think, be significantly easier with fewer minds to make aware. In a world of nearly 8 billion, is it ever possible to make enough "see" at the same time? And do it without harsh acts of repression? Changing a mind isn't like changing a tire.

***"Imagine a large population of Bertrand Russells—a Bertrand Russell Island—each of whom will inspect every doctrine placed before them, and will infallibly consign each doctrine to its proper place: the error bin or the correct bin. However, in each case, it takes a week to decide. Even on this ideally rational island, all new bad ideas would propagate for a week or more. Bertrand Russell Island is like any normal population with birth and death. Because there's always youthful Bertrand Russells who have yet to inspect the bad ideas, bogus ideas could, in principle, last forever. There would still be a disconnect between the system of ideas spreading and the rationality/cognitive power of the individuals in the population. You don't have to think that some people are irrational or closed to argument to explain the prevalence of error or stupid ideas. Even Bertrand Russell Island would have fake news." [\[Source\]](#)***

In the past thirty years we have seen an imposed culture sweep across the developing world. The increase in processed foods, the increase in mindless entertainment options, all designed to create the same docility and timidity that the first wave of culture imposition had created in the West.

For me it's been fascinating to watch how the Chinese government has increasingly turned their people into consumers resembling citizens in the West. It's not quite the same as getting into a time machine and going back to watch Bernays begin his manipulations but it certainly rhymes. I suppose this is a great example of how

#WeThePeople of the world need to unite to fight these things.

I don't think people appreciate enough just where certain tendencies of our current elite's thinking will lead. Everything is being "perfected" and standardized. There is quickly becoming one "right way" to do things (unless you're really drunk on the CRT kool-aid in which case "one right way" is clearly white supremacist thinking). Everything is being turned into data points that can be analyzed and mined and tweaked in the quest for efficiency. The logical outcome of that kind of thinking is a global managerial class coordinating all 8 billion of us so that we can exist "optimally & efficiently."

***"Having squeezed every last drop of "value" from the earth, and with no more land to settle or markets to discover, capital's approaching apotheosis finds it looking for a lifeline by creating a virtual copy of itself, where intellectual property supplants physical property and human biological and behavioral processes are recast as a grotesque form of human labor.***

***Efforts are now underway to "translate" the real world into a digital counterfeit that can provide financial markets with the figures and statistics it needs to execute the contracts of the incipient human capital markets - an insidious new form of capital assembled from our genetic code and other kinds of data that will form the basis of a financialized wonderland, enforced by blockchain technology and constantly monitored and***

***updated through the burgeoning biosecurity state.***

***Led by the world's most powerful hedge funds and transnational corporations, the so-called Great Reset amounts to little more than a campaign to turn humanity into datasets, which they can use to create more profits for themselves and their clients." [\[Source\]](#)***

As is often the case, these things are trialed within institutions first, where the Watchers already possess a greater amount of control & autonomy, often combined with less transparency. Prisons, schools, and healthcare systems are the usual suspects.

***"The concept behind social impact bonds requires a fully digital ecosystem that can track and aggregate data on individuals who are a part of any kind of state or municipal service such as prisons. With such pervasive tracking, a subject's progression through that system can be measured and linked to milestones tied to financial instruments, which investors (or stakeholders) can hold, buy or sell on the open market.***

***Known as stakeholder capitalism, this new form of exploitation is already being tested in many places around the world and prisons are among the main targets for its implementation, as they provide an ideal and literally captive market for its proof of concept.***



***Alison McDowell's pioneering independent research on this topic has exposed many of the insidious ways in which pay-for-success schemes like SIBs and other human capital market ideas are being foisted onto America's public education and healthcare systems through the "gamification" of schooling and health pathways." [\[Source\]](#)***

We as humans aren't equipped for this kind of existence. The meaning and real social bonds that we crave cannot be properly met by their digital "replacements". Living a life without any real meaning is a tiresome affair.

For most of human history, the ideas and individuals you interacted with were largely those that were physically close to you. Without Wikipedia, Twitter, etc, the minds of the people around you were the ones you reached out to. Now how many children see their elders as nothing but repositories of outdated, useless knowledge? How many homes are filled with people who barely speak to one another?

Instead we speak increasingly where Big Brother's friends can hear us loud and clear. Private intelligence outfits are being used to get around constitutional prohibitions on government conduct, and because they're private entities far too many people don't have a problem with what they're doing. One of the most insidious things at least a few of these outfits will be doing is attempting to use AI to deanonymize & connect every identity & alias online to a real person using tools like writing analysis. A database like this in the hands of government is a freedom killer.

I must admit I'm not sure how much good any of the old political labels do us (Populist included). But since we're

going to keep using them for some time I think we need to not place so much emphasis on past incarnations & understandings and instead dig into what people who are labeling themselves (or being labeled) actually believe. We could also, when analyzing both past & present incarnations, pay much more attention to their authoritarian or libertarian nature, regardless of what the label is. These days you can tell a lot about a person's character & worldview simply based on their principles related to censorship & free speech (and how consistently they apply them).

Some form of Populism or Nationalism (though, as I say, I'm open to the argument these terms are not wholly accurate or useful descriptors) seems to be the only thing capable of putting the brakes on these trends. But it needs to be a perhaps odd form of Nationalism or Populism, one which seeks to also empower the #WeThePeople of other nations as well. Because we Americans are only a mere 300 million souls and the elites of the the world must all be crushed before their technocratic tools of oppression are fully implemented. If the Chinese people and the Indian people and all the peoples of Africa are brought to heel by the elites there will be no hope for the rest of the world's peoples.

*"People are wonderful, religions & government are corrupt."*

--@robertemmet

I think if we cut away all the frilly rhetoric we probably only have 3 camps in this country:

The Elites

The Captured

The Free-ish Thinkers

Which, in that framing, would mean you could look at it two ways:

- You've got two smaller groups fighting over control of the larger third group, The Captured
- You've got a tiny group weaponizing a large group against a small group.

Though like everything in life it's probably some melding of the two.

I also wonder if a majority of The Captured & The Free-ish Thinkers actually do have very opposite views on meaningful issues or if it is just a vocal minority of The Captured (amplified by The Elite) which creates the illusion of widespread divisions. The tendency of many humans to shy away from conflict would also enhance the illusion I think since silence can be seen as agreement or at the least acquiescence.

One issue we face is that too many of those who might be considered Free-ish thinkers have taken counterproductive stances that ignore real-world reality. For example, the "rugged individualism" thing so many conservatives have adopted works fantastic for an elite seeking to consolidate their power. We can't do this alone.

I also wonder to what extent various fictional depictions (and even some glossy historical summaries) of change have contributed to the apathy toward real activism & organization. It's always so neat and tidy in media portrayals, the gritty & tedious work fades into the background and the final outcome shines prominently in the spotlight. But real change is mostly nothing but gritty & tedious work and much of the time you get no praise or applause, instead you just get criticism and pessimism.

If you could create and develop a set of processes which would actively empower people while they trained and developed their analytical skills you would be providing something with a higher likelihood of becoming self-reinforcing. The problem is this type of thing is dominated by wannabe gurus and grifters of all sorts. And all want to lock it up behind various paywalls or offer up tidbits as bait for their little business schemes. Which is absolutely going to influence the ideas and concepts themselves, likely in a negative way.

Social media provides an excellent tool to do what I outlined above, perhaps helping to make up for all the negative effects it has had. So I'm attempting to use this channel to provide a real-world, live, evolving example of putting such processes to use in the hopes that others will be inspired to join in (and ideally end up doing a much better job than I am). We need to find ways to remind people that everything meaningful was once small and insignificant but through diligence and effort and a bit of luck it became something magnificent & massive. Like our home did.

Rather than feed desperate people narratives to keep them misinformed & docile like Q, we need to feed them narratives to make them informed & powerful. The same emotions and energies Q tapped into are still there, ripe for the harnessing by those willing to step up and make the attempt. And if the good people don't, some no good shifty grifter sure will.

Always remember: Every planet was once a tiny speck...and then BAM, the moment hits and what was once but a speck in the vacuum begins to agglomerate and grow ever larger. That's all "great" people ever are: specks that got bigger.

We find ourselves perched upon the sole rock for many many miles capable of maintaining our lives. Yet we exploit & defile the only home we've ever known, the planet which gives us life, our Eden. Why? I think the reason humans destroy their Eden is a desire for control ultimately rooted in fear of death. This fear is made so clear by Transhumanism's goals of "freeing" the human mind from the physical body.

The social construct is corrupting. The child may be born "pure" but hardship, struggle, and fear will soon be known, one way or another. Without a solid cultural foundation these fears can become neuroses and...well terrible things usually ensue.

We often fear the unknown, so we attempt to make the unknown known, by whatever means we can. Today we argue that science is great tool for doing so and before that we relied on stories, myths, fables, Gods, etc. But both are just the imperfect human's attempt to make sense of the world.

I think awhile back a particular culture or group of cultures ended up settling on stories which made them increasingly more powerful. This was to the detriment of cultures with different foundations, most of whom are now extinct. Our society is the end result of that.

Before this COVID nonsense the Transhumanist thugs were prowling the neighborhood, maybe lurking on the lawn. COVID is them getting us to open the door a crack so they can jam their boot in the gap. The consequences of this technology are going to so outweigh any meager benefit. And that we're rushing it into use over a virus 99% survive just makes it all the more insanely foolish.

But it's hard to recall what the experience of being thoroughly propagandized feels like once you've gotten yourself disenchanted. From the outside it clearly looks like absolute trash, but from the inside it seems like the only logical course.

*"I am trying to save the world for my family"*

*--@eucalyptus*

That is, I believe, the hardest path of all to walk. But likely the most necessary for more and more of us to take. We all have within us the capabilities to create great things. We just need to be allowed the time to explore & develop those skills.

***"The Russian anarchist, geographer and writer Prince Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921) observed both nature and natural beings and related his findings to human beings. In the book "Mutual Aid in the Animal and Human World", Kropotkin writes that in nature and society there is by no means only a struggle of all against all (social Darwinism), but that the principle of "mutual aid" also prevails. Those living beings that implement this principle would survive more successfully.***

...

***Karl Marx was right: when man has the security of his life, he thinks differently. He has different thoughts, different feelings and a different relationship to his fellow man. Man becomes different when he has the table laid. He has different feelings than the one who lives in insecurity, is exploited, is poor...In his***

***whole emotional life and thinking he is taken up by this." [\[Source\]](#)***

Unfortunately, "time" is exactly what so many have so little of these days. I don't think the old adage of "Slow & steady wins the race" is applicable here. Though, how fast is careless and how fast is prudent? I fear we won't know that until our ability to decide the pace is already gone.

We've (Humanity) seen this show before. The people asking such questions may dress differently but we're connected across time by the same uncertain inquiry. Though, our friends in the past were better off than us in one sense: they didn't have to contend with things like nanotechnology, nuclear weapons, and genetic engineering.

With the technocrats pounding on our door it's "now or never". But look at what these technocrats accomplished in the past twelve months. If modern revolutions are largely a PR game then #WeThePeople would lose bigly given the current status quo. But time IS running out. There's a deadline but when it exactly is remains a mystery. And if we want to meet it, and truly have a chance at defeating the technocratic elite, we'll need to begin building resilient communities. And we'll need to start now.

A divided We the People is an empowered Elite. It always has been. It always will.

## 6.

# Every Breath You Take, Every Move You Make

*"If our society is founded on fictions, which it is, tearing them down only helps if we have a secure platform on which to land and bring others along with us."*

*--@themorrigan1973*

Encouraging people to purchase so much of what once required the building & maintaining of relationships was probably unwise. There's a trend of people defining "civilized" as offloading more and more of what would normally have been handled between people in ad-hoc, often far from perfect manners, onto a standardized bureaucratic regime. Any mistakes are seized upon as reasons why more and more must be brought into the fold and the tinkering and data analysis must always increase so we can become ever more perfect. The end of the road of all this is a Transhumanist hellscape, the Final Cage.

***"...In 1988, the theoretical physicist Freeman Dyson published *Infinite in All Directions*, a wide-ranging discourse on humanity's role in the universe. In his book, Dyson predicts that genetic engineering will enable manufactured organic minds that are merged with electronic components including AI, but inside their biological mental core, they will be alive and self-aware.***



***According to futurists ranging from Dyson and Ray Kurzweil to Elon Musk, a millennium from now, if not much, much sooner, only a small fraction of the conscious intelligent beings once known as humans will exist as humanoids we would recognize as ourselves. Others, to present a vivid example, could exist as the conscious brain of a starship, with nerves extending into every system of the craft, interfacing with the minds of similarly cybernetic passengers and crew.***

***...***

***Credible speculation is limited only by one's imagination, and it's happening fast. But what does it mean for society in the short run?***

***In America, the reality of AI running systems as mundane as a thermostat and as complex as an airliner or a power grid leads to something Victor Davis Hanson alluded to in a recent article in American Greatness, where he wrote, "In today's age of computer-driven avionics, the prerequisite ability to do math, to know something about navigation, to understand computers, or to have the proper temperament to fly a plane doesn't really matter."***

***...***

***Coming soon, instead of education, people will have access to implants or neural links that target and enhance specific skills—memory, language, math. Equally likely, and also coming soon, people will be able to edit the genes of their offspring before they are born,***

***choosing their attributes—height, appearance, intellect.***

***...***

***Americans today need to reflect carefully on the opportunities for physical and mental enhancement that are just around the corner. Because as these new devices worm into our minds in ways more profound and more permanent than smartphones and social networks already have, they will not be merely Pavlovian manipulators, they will be programmed orchestrators. The machines will pick the options, within our own minds, and we will comply.***

***...***

***Try to imagine human civilization as it expands into the solar system and eventually to the stars. Shall it be a vibrant society of free individuals or a drab collective? Shall it consist of a federation of diverse, independent nations, with their cultures and traditions grounding them as they reach into the beyond, or an undifferentiated mass of humans controlled by machine implants, ruled by a single politburo?" [\[Source\]](#)***

Today if you want to put up a barn most people would call a contractor who would then come out and erect the barn. In the past, such things would often have involved many members of the community. You help raise Bill's barn and Bill and his sons help raise your cousin's barn, etc. It doesn't have to be a barn, it could be anything you can't really do on your own.

But people don't like to help people who don't help them. So in order to have this help & support when you needed it you would have to put in the time to build & maintain friendships or at the least friendly relations. Today, you could be a stereotype of the rude & crass Wall St banker, make immense sums of money, and have all of your needs still be met.

By allowing the purchase of these things we've encouraged people to become increasingly antisocial. The removal of the human contact element with the internet seems to have supercharged this trend. It's in part a critique of consumerism, but I am trying to take it further. People tend to associate frivolous goods or luxury items with consumerism but I believe it's negative effects extend into other areas as well. China's a great example of a place where they're still straddling both worlds but they are rapidly speeding away from one.

*"They were all part of group at that school that has a hard time with relating to humans...I suspect maybe they were extremely high functioning autistics."*

[--@themorrigan1973](#)

Some of these folks would definitely be on the spectrum but how much of this alienation from humans that so many feel is a result of our alienating cultures? Something which has been a problem for quite some time in many countries. It's part of why I don't see the whole Transhumanism thing as inevitable. I believe if we are able to change our understandings of certain aspects of ourselves & our societies we will not fall prey to the seductions of Transhumanist fantasies.

I'm a big fan of looking at history to help inform us about the present. However I think we often run into dangerous territory by not properly contextualizing those lessons. For example, it's certainly correct that the price of things (in general) that were previously only the domain of the elite have gone down (though I'm not sure your average person will today be able to purchase a boat the size of Columbus's, and certainly not three of them). But, we shouldn't just assume that every technological advancement is good or even should happen. This, I think, is one of our most dangerous blindspots. I've argued elsewhere that we have focused far too much on technological advancement and far too little on spiritual advancement. With the technology today, which was previously the domain of the rich, we experience rampant depression, despair, alienation, loneliness, etc. Why should we assume that more advanced forms will lead to different outcomes? Why should we not look at this bit of history and then proceed with far more caution?

*"Just a reminder for everyone reminiscing. The events of the past placed us in the situation that we are currently in."*

[--@sal et lucem nuncium](#)

The Amish offer an interesting example here. They rode the tech bandwagon to a point and then got off. We could certainly debate whether they got off too early or too late but they do maybe provide an example of a more "middle path."

I think a big part of what we'll need to do in the coming years is really attempt to bring nuance back to the public discussion. There's useful technological improvements but more importantly there's many more harms that can result.

It's great that we can build a ditch without a day of backbreaking labor. But at what cost? Maybe the ditch digging improvement is an overall positive (despite the fact that a mass grave is also a kind of ditch that could be created more efficiently with fewer bodies) but not every problem is going to look like a ditch. It's like the old cliché "you've got a hammer, everything looks like a nail."

Our obsession with technology & automation also seems to spring up from our (well really a narrow segment of us) neverending obsession with efficiency. But I like inefficiency. It adds difficulty. It encourages questioning whether something should be done at all. It slows things down to a more human speed. We just need to look at things like high-frequency trading algos to see what horrors some highly-efficient program can do. And perhaps most important: efficiency using technology results in the concentration of control.

***"Whatever victories have apparently been achieved in the long struggle to achieve political representation, human rights, dignity, economic justice, cultural and gender identity, ecological sustainability and other causes dear to the hearts of those who have struggled, the elite (local, national or global) has always retained control and merely surrendered the minimum necessary to keep the bulk of the human population submissive.***

***Consequently...while elite control over human societies started to gather pace with the Neolithic revolution 12,000 years ago, it has simply been progressively consolidated since that time. Real power over anything that matters, including fundamental decision-***

***making and the vast bulk of the world's wealth, remains firmly in the hands of the elite.***

***More importantly, as one result of the elite's long reign and the grotesquely distorted priorities it has advanced within the delusional versions of democracy we have experienced, human society is now characterized by staggering levels of psychological, social, economic, military and geopolitical dysfunctionality and Earth is on the brink of ecological collapse with Homo sapiens threatened by four distinct paths to extinction."*** [\[Source\]](#)

Consider for a moment the "humble" drone: The array of possible sensors and the area of coverage in both space & time of these drones is just mind-boggling. These drone-mounted sensors are the closest the elite have gotten yet to being able to provide the same kind of trails & tracking that is available to them in the digital realm.

Why do so many go along with these plans? Especially in media circles? I think when we search for dramatic reasons for things we may miss the more mundane. Bill Gates, via both his wealth & his foundations, gains status and reputation, including through using those resources to provide free information for easy consumption by media people who have been increasingly turned into cogs rewriting corporate press releases, which itself is caused by the neverending desire for more streamlining & efficiency...and well it just spirals like that all the way back to some monkey around a fire probably.

Is Bill Gates (and other powerful people who think like him) controlling the mainstream storylines for a variety of topics? Absolutely. But is it because of Pedo pics he's using as blackmail? I don't think so. I think here's where Chomsky's quote about media figures not being where they were if they didn't think the way they do comes in:

*"Well, I know some of the best, and best-known, investigative reporters in the United States - I won't mention names - whose attitude towards the media is much more cynical than mine. In fact, they regard the media as a sham. And they know, and they consciously talk about how they try to play it like a violin. If they see a little opening, they'll try to squeeze something in that ordinarily wouldn't make it through. And it's perfectly true that the majority - I'm sure you're speaking for the majority of journalists who are trained - have it driven into their heads, that this is a crusading profession, adversarial, we stand up against power. A very self-serving view. On the other hand, in my opinion, I hate to make a value judgement but, the better journalists and, in fact, the ones who are often regarded as the best journalists have quite a different picture. And I think a very realistic one.*

*I'm not saying your self-censoring. I'm sure you believe everything you're saying. But what I'm saying is that if you believe something different, you wouldn't be sitting where you're sitting."*

*--Noam Chomsky*

With the professionalization of everything, including journalism, these people are being trained to think a very specific way from an increasingly early age. By the time

they're spit out by the education system and deemed credentialed enough for their chosen pursuit there's really only one right way to view the world for so so many of them.

***"When Schwab talks about how a grand ideal of a standard issue One World Government model, what he calls the Neoliberal Utopia simply will not work, I breathe a sigh of relief:***

***"Consider a global government [that] regulates multinational companies in global markets, and people gather in a global democracy and global unions. It is an unrealistic and undesirable goal, as it increases the distance between individuals and the immediate social ecosystems they are a part of. It also decreases their feeling of commitment to the people and the environment closest to them...Though the 20th century neoliberals once may have seen such a global model as a Utopian ideal, it would inevitably end in the political disenfranchisement of local communities. When the center of power is too far removed from people's everyday realities, neither political governance nor economic decision-making would have popular support."***

***...***

***But then, the more I read, the more I couldn't shake the sense that when a guy like Schwab means by the word "commitment, what he really means is "obedience". Schwab understands that people aren't really going to accept decisions from on high, especially if on high is a centralized world government.***



...

***We get some insight by looking at the list of "Deep Shifts" Schwab predicts in his earlier book: The Fourth Industrial Revolution, where he posits what the big changes are that are coming at us in terms of tipping points, positive outcomes, negative outcomes and "unknown / cuts both ways".***

...

***Together, they coalesce to usher in an impetus toward Transhumanism ordered by Big Data and AI that will probably, in lieu of any honest debate or public consultation around these shifts, result in a type of social credit system.***

***And that's what is missing from Schwab's books. There is nothing in the framework where local communities can identify and define what they see as problems for themselves and work toward solving them. There is no mechanism for asserting their own priorities of types of things the communities themselves may value above the WEF's "Deep Shifts", such as full or meaningful employment, privacy, or self-sovereign health care." [\[Source\]](#)***

So really we're playing a game of Chicken. The elite are racing to get us into the Final Cage and we free-thinkers are racing to awake enough and develop actual workable solutions before that cage door slams shut. But taking out any particular elite themselves will not necessarily stop the march to the cage, though it may slow it (but it could also accelerate it).

I've been playing recently with an argument that Transhumanists are attempting to insidiously undermine human rights via widespread acceptance of transgenderism. By so radically altering the nature of being human in that way, it makes it much much easier to get people to embrace their ultimate redefinitions. If we're ever going to encounter a Pandora's Box in our modern times I believe this ideology will be what opens it. Some argue we've already opened it but I think we've just unwrapped the plastic film on the box, an important milestone but not one we can't come back from.

While there are bits and pieces scattered, they have not yet perfected any single one nor integrated them all together. CRISPR is still inaccurate, many of these inventions are still niche, there's still a very negative reaction by many to even simple things like RFID chip injections. I just don't see widespread usage as being an inevitability. We can still strangle this baby in its crib.

And given the way we treat those we consider less than ourselves...well until that changes it's an Us or Them fight to the death from my perspective. Thankfully we find ourselves in the Cold War information stage though the Transhumanists are engaging in ever more aggressive actions.

If I may attempt a different analogy than Pandora: We've got a bunch of monkeys that found a fully fueled & armed tank. So far they've really just played with the gun on top. But it can be loud and seemingly erratic so they've so far been cautious. But a few monkeys have been engaging in focused practice and are becoming confident they can use it properly. Meanwhile others have been tinkering about inside experimenting with other controls as well as the main gun. If they figure out how to start the thing and begin moving it

around, the destruction to our world will resemble the after effects of that fellow who armored a bulldozer and went for a ride around a formerly quiet Colorado town.

***"...Backed by the Rockefeller Foundation and its associated philanthropic organizations, the UN's SDG program stands out as one of the cornerstones of the Great Reset, which now features Covid-19 as the fulcrum of that project and underlies what pioneering independent researcher Alison McDowell, interviewed by MintPress for this article, calls "theological technofascism."***

***Christened as the fourth sector, this merger of "the corporate state [...] with nonprofits and religion," as McDowell puts it, operates through so-called "benefit corporations," a novel incorporation structure the rules of which were developed and funded by the Rockefeller Foundation's B Lab. Based on the "environmental social governance" or ESG framework, Certified B Corporations allow company executives to be shielded to a considerable extent from their shareholders and, therefore, provided with an unprecedented measure of freedom as a result of the ostensibly socially and environmentally beneficial entity.***

***This new face of capitalism intends to function under the aegis of what is referred to as the "Impact Economy" — an idea that arose out of the ashes of the controlled demolition of the global financial system in 2008, which paved the way for hedge funds to replace banks as***

***the dominant force in the world of global capital. That world is currently ruled by The Blackstone Group Inc., which controls a mind-boggling half trillion dollars under asset management, not to mention having the distinction of being the world's biggest landlord and, ominously, the owner of the largest private DNA database on the planet.***

***...***

***Blackstone's ability to monetize our DNA is not limited by existing markets, however. Its significant stake in healthcare, insurance and retail companies gives the private equity firm the capacity to mix-and-match the collective data sets they own to spin off new segments, along the lines of Ancestry.com's Spotify partnership to design "DNA-designed music playlists" and other less benign behavioral and genetic dataset combinations...." [\[Source\]](#)***

It seems to me that these endeavors are the culmination of an ideology which has swept the world leaving destruction in its wake. And this isn't some anti-white/anti-European rant of course, these folks have come in all colors. It's a further wedge between humans and the aspects of the world not created by human hands.

***"[Dr. Bradley A.] Perkins highlights the critically important shift from "volume-based health care to value-based health care." Perkins is referring here to cold, hard cash as the rest of his seminar makes clear, given how genomics "will drive tremendous progress in life and health insurance [as well as] tremendous progress in healthcare delivery by***

***powering a next generation of healthcare and healthcare models."***

***"What we are about to embark on," Perkins boldly predicts, is nothing less than "hacking the software of life," and "for the first time, trying to understand all the instructions that build, operate and reproduce us as humans." He illustrates his point with a disturbing anecdote about how genomic pioneer Venter "sat down at a computer with the notion that he could actually design a genome, a sequence of DNA letters; produce that genome artificially; insert it into a membrane and boot up life from scratch."***

***Perkins considers that Venter's 2010 brainstorm might have been even "more important" than the sequencing of the human genome, itself. The eureka moment when a Western scientist developed a God-complex is what will change "medicine from a clinical science supported by data to a data science supported by clinicians," according to Perkins, who goes on to warn of the "profound disruption in our current format for the practice of medicine," that he confidently states will no longer "be possible in the place that we're going very shortly." [Source]***

Now some might argue that we should not deny anyone the right to try these things. Especially those effected by tragedy & disability. But even then I can't help but see echoes of a band of natives standing on a beach looking out at a large ship.

Disability & tragedy have always been trojan horses, I think. A big part of the problem is we lack the cultural structures & belief systems which allow us to engage with those all-too-human things (so we have Ray & company wanting to defeat death). In a sense it's a bit like the concept that even if we could torture one person (Le Guin writes about something similar in her tale about Omelas) to make the world great we shouldn't do it because of all the after-effects taking such a stance would have.

We may one day be able to have both the technology to make paralyzed individuals walk again AND the spiritual advancements necessary to use such technology "safely" and "wisely." But we certainly do not possess those spiritual qualities currently.

***"In Aldous Huxley's 1932 novel "Brave New World," people aren't born from a mother's womb. Instead, embryos are grown in artificial wombs until they are brought into the world, a process called ectogenesis. In the novel, technicians in charge of the hatcheries manipulate the nutrients they give the fetuses to make the newborns fit the desires of society. Two recent scientific developments suggest that Huxley's imagined world of functionally manufactured people is no longer far-fetched.***

***On March 17, 2021, an Israeli team announced that it had grown mouse embryos for 11 days - about half of the gestation period - in artificial wombs that were essentially bottles. Until this experiment, no one had grown a mammal embryo outside a womb this far into pregnancy. Then, on April 15, 2021, a U.S. and***

***Chinese team announced that it had successfully grown, for the first time, embryos that included both human and monkey cells in plates to a stage where organs began to form." [\[Source\]](#)***

There are already tinkerers going beyond fixing disability & preventing tragedy. This Transhumanist problem, like so many of our problems, is unlikely to be solved well using violence (though that doesn't mean some won't try). We need to do the more difficult work of changing minds. Thankfully there's much overlap, I think, between the support of Transhumanism and support for other problems we face. Undermining one helps undermine them all. And maybe, just maybe, this path is the one that leads us to those necessary spiritual advancements.

Currently, any attempts to ban it (if you could even gain the power to make a meaningful attempt) would likely result in something like what we've seen with Prohibition & the War on Drugs. But at some point a line will get crossed (where the line is will depend on the person though) where those downsides may have to be risked.

***"The missionaries of "free-market economics" are pulling out all the stops to convince us that they really do have the people's best interest at heart this time, after centuries of ceaseless war, ruthless corruption and environmental devastation. Suddenly, a public health emergency has managed to peer into their soulless chasm and not only sparked a long-dead sense of compassion, but coincidentally provided them with all the solutions. The only catch is that we have to give up our humanity and live behind screens***

***and speak to each other via encrypted messaging apps only.***

***Other than that, they assure us, everything is as it always should have been. They've seen the error of their ways and are ready to usher in a more humane, a more "sustainable" economic paradigm, in which the wealthy finally invest in the poor, the sick and the homeless as part of a new "moral" economy. But, the obvious question is, if misery becomes profitable, what incentive is there for its eradication?" [\[Source\]](#)***

Some people argue "we" (in this case: The US) have to research genetic modification, advanced weaponry, interplanetary human travel, etc because the Chinese and the Russians will & are. But these endeavors are just as useless and just as potentially harmful to the average people of China & Russia as they are to average Americans. The leaders of these countries are engaged in these things because they are just as deluded as our own leaders. Average people everywhere need to unite and topple these narrow minded & truly unimaginative fools. If the Chinese people and the Indian people and all the peoples of Africa are brought to heel by the elites there will be no hope for the rest of the world's peoples.

The idea that we might have reached a point where we've actually done enough technological development and should wind down the R&D efforts would strike many as insane. Maybe so. But could it also be plausible that we are so willing to believe it is insane simply because we have so heavily focused on technological progress at the expense of spiritual development?



*"One thing is for sure...things are fast converging into a shitstorm of the likes the world has never seen."*

--@[jayvisible](#)

The comparison to appeasing Hitler gets thrown around a lot but I can't think of a more perfect fit than our technocratic Transhumanist elites. Humans have waged bloody wars over far more minor differences in belief systems. Transhumanism's boosters seem to be pushing for the ultimate civil war. Considering how mediocre our elite propagandists are in general and how intelligent the average person is in ways not measured by credentials I still have hope for achieving the "W". But, if we remain separate they win by running out the clock on humanity...literally.

## 7.

# The Dual Dangers of Ephemeral & Emotionally-Manipulative Media

## A Brave New Age

*"I feel sad that the brave new age of instant information didn't make things or us better. We may need to re-evolve as humanity before any of this makes any impact at all."*

*--@themorrigan1973*

One human can recognize the problems, but that realization alone does not transform the quicksand, because all those ignorant others are still believing, still supporting, still attempting to suck that one human back down. We cannot truly escape without freeing the masses. How many people today can quote verbatim countless movies of previous eras, yet have no clue about the real world crimes of people like Fauci?

***"With a small "night-watchmen" state, it might be feasible for the ordinary citizen to inspect the government's business. However, the costs to any citizen of monitoring the thousands of programs emerging from the myriad ministries of our bloated governments is extremely high compared to the minuscule benefit or cost imposed on him by any one of those policies. Introducing state-licensing for a trade, for example, has typically meant that***

***the established corporations with their accumulated capital, political connections, and specialism in their field get to “assist the state” in writing the rules that govern their niche. With all these forces mounted against the citizen, it’s not surprising that we then get stuck with politically stronger versions of the overbearing corporations which our “radically reimagined” and “comprehensive” policies were meant to curb.” [Source]***

For most of human history, the individual minds & personalities you interacted with were those that were in your immediate physical surroundings. With the advent of mass communication, from the written word on crude paper to the internet, we increasingly ceded that spotlight to faraway minds. How many children no longer look to their immediate elders for wisdom? How many find that the contents of their minds, their lifetime's worth of acquired wisdom, is valued at near-zero by those others who surround them? What does this do to us as individuals and entire societies?

One consequence: Far too many children are not taught how to properly deal with their emotions. Instead they learn from TV and movies whose portrayals are of course exaggerations. The descriptions & depictions of these emotions often implies a powerlessness to resist which is a terrible message to send to a still developing child. Not a great message for adults either.

It seems, in addition, that the inundation of peoples' minds with fake dramatic fiction has dulled the senses to the mundane truths reality so often provides. I wonder if this desensitization prohibits us from returning directly to a more fact-focused kind of journalism. Just as someone might need

to be weaned off powerful medications, do we need to actively provide more emotion-laden analysis whose underlying goals are to hopefully direct as many as possible back onto more reliable ground, eventually?

Perhaps most insidious however, is the increasingly ephemeral nature of media. Journalism is often called the "first draft of history." Lets set aside discussions of journalistic quality and instead focus on the permanence of that draft understanding. As with any draft, we expect there to be mistakes. No journalist is perfect, you'll get a name or title wrong, you might even misattribute a whole quote or get your budget numbers switched around. It happens and a simple correction with a note is seen as perfectly acceptable. But what we are experiencing today, with more and more frequency, is alterations, "corrections," which go way beyond this normal practice. We're not discussing revising a draft, this is rewriting the entire story (or at least key elements of it).

Though this is not the only kind of ephemeral media that we should be concerned about. The memory-holing doesn't end with altered news stories. No, it advances much further into the realm of complete censorship. Any really inconvenient truths are swept under the rug, or if you're of the "Harry Potter generation" (terrible books by the way, the best thing about JK Rowling is her stance on transgenderism) then perhaps you'd prefer a comparison to Voldemort.

These dangers, the emotional-manipulativeness & the increasingly ephemeral nature of journalism & information, pose a grave threat to the continuation of a free society. Tools like journalism are supposed to aid us in overcoming our more reactionary impulses. Tools like the written word

are supposed to aid us in preserving a record of past thought & argument.

***"...the really desirable potential of the web is the exact opposite of majoritarian rule: the non-rule of any section of the public, minority or majority.***

***Its genuine promise lies in the free entry of any expression that can be represented or hosted in the cybersphere: a belief, an argument, a debate, a proposal, a news-report, a work of visual art, music, a poem, or an ongoing cooperation of some kind. More than that, the web stands for a transformative and sometimes disruptive networked-social life, bringing about inventive ways of connecting and sharing....***

***...***

***But are the tech giants going to distort our perception of the truth and install their ideological narrative and fake worldviews? Yuval Noah Harari seems to think so, or at least that possibility is implied by his view of people. Lesson number 17 of his book, 21 Lessons For The 21st Century, is entitled "Post-Truth: Some Fake News Lasts Forever":***

***"Homo sapiens is a post-truth species, whose power depends on creating and believing fictions. Ever since the Stone Age, self-reinforcing myths have served to unite human collectives. Indeed, Homo sapiens conquered this planet thanks above all to the unique human ability to create and spread fictions..."***

***The truth is that truth was never high on the agenda of Homo sapiens. Many people assume that if a particular religion or ideology misrepresents reality, its adherents are bound to discover it sooner or later, because they will not be able to compete with more clear-sighted rivals. Well, that's just another comforting myth." [\[Source\]](#)***

## Puppeteered Emotions

***"In the last four years especially, a rift has formed in the news business, an argument primarily about method and approach. Some of us were raised to think the reporter's job is confined to gathering information and giving it to readers, who should then be free to do with it what they will. A lot of journalists raised in this school were trained to be terrified in the days (and, especially, the nights) after publication, in case a mistake surfaces, but to stop worrying after that.***

***A new approach, symbolized by a Times column four years ago called "Trump Is Testing the Norms of Objectivity in Journalism," stresses choosing and presenting information in such a way as to ensure that audiences make the "correct" political decision with the news they're given. The fear there is more about impact: are people taking the news the right way?***

***This argument over method put many journalists in a bind. Some either had to get on board with what they considered a perversion of the job, or they had to find some other place to go." [\[Source\]](#)***

The increasingly awful New York Times (though its always wise, when gauging their rate of descent, to remember their coverage of Hitler) provides a fine example of this "new" kind of journalism in practice (via Matt Taibbi):

***"When Biden decided not to punish Saudi Prince Mohammed bin Salman for the murder of Washington Post writer Jamal Khashoggi on the grounds that the "cost" of "breaching the relationship with one of America's key Arab allies" was too high, the New York Times headline read: "Biden Won't Penalize Saudi Crown Prince Over Khashoggi's Killing, Fearing Relations Breach." When Donald Trump made the same calculation, saying he couldn't cut ties because "the world is a very dangerous place" and "our relationship is with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia," the paper joined most of the rest of the press corps in howling in outrage.***

***"In Extraordinary Statement, Trump Stands With Saudis Despite Khashoggi Killing." was the Times headline, in a piece that said Trump's decision was "a stark distillation of the Trump worldview: remorselessly transactional, heedless of the facts, determined to put America's interests first, and founded on a theory of moral equivalence." The paper noted, "Even Mr. Trump's staunchest allies on Capitol Hill expressed revulsion."***

***This week, in its "Crusader for the Poor" piece, the Times described Biden's identical bin Salman decision as mere evidence that he remains "in the cautious middle" in his foreign policy. The paper previously had David Sanger dig up a quote from former Middle East negotiator Dennis Ross, who "applauded Mr. Biden for 'trying to thread the needle***



***here... This is the classic example of where you have to balance your values and your interests.'” It’s two opposite takes on exactly the same thing.***

***...***

***This format isn’t all that different from the one we had before, except in one respect: without the superficial requirement to tend to a two-party balance, the hagiography in big media organizations flies out of control. These companies already tend to wash out people who are too contentious or anti-establishment in their leanings. Promoted instead, as even Noam Chomsky described a generation ago, are people with the digestive systems of jackals or monitor lizards, who can swallow even the most toxic piles of official nonsense without blinking. Still, those reporters once had to at least pretend to be something other than courtiers, as it was considered unseemly to openly gush about a party or a politician.***  
***[\[Source\]](#)***

The professionalization of everything has had a reciprocal effect: the infantilization of many. Lacking the broad array of skills for survival once possessed by the masses, our modern masses are unmoored & isolated. These individuals often lack even the space, let alone the skills, to provide themselves with something as simple & essential as food. Such essential tasks are outsourced to a knowledgeable few and the skills crucial to survival atrophy in the minds of the masses. There are consequences, some paid by individuals and some by society itself.

***"Many of us want to be led. As children we look to our parents to protect us, to soothe our fears, to relieve us of responsibility. As adults we seek the same protection..."***

***...***

***And so trustingly, time after time, we relinquish our power to those grandiose individuals who covet high office, unaware that their determination - their sheer, dogged, winner-takes-all ambition, their superficial charm and seductiveness - may suggest that many are psychologically unsuited to these roles.***

***...***

***We don't imagine that psychopaths might be journalists.***

***So, we heed their warnings about the virus, which accord with those of our leaders. Though they might confuse us with their reporting of 'cases' and 'positive tests' and 'hospitalisations' - with their graphs and statistics and relative risks - we are reassured that the message is a simple one: that the jab will be our route to freedom; that our vaccine rollout is the fastest; that our NHS is the finest in the world: clap clap clap clap clap!"***

***[\[Source\]](#)***

The Covid "crisis" has proven to be fertile ground for growing the media's manipulation skillset. While the marketing of consumer products and social science studies can provide useful insights in how to properly motivate the masses nothing compares to the real-world laboratory. The lessons

learned from Covid are already planned to be repurposed for other campaigns:

***"CNN's technical director was caught on video admitting that the cable "news" network traffics in propaganda under the guise of journalism in order achieve a desired political outcome.***

***The director, Charlie Chester, described in Part One of Project Veritas' "CNN Exposed" series how the network used propaganda to benefit Joe Biden and get former President Trump voted out of office.***

***During a conversation with an undercover Project Veritas reporter, Chester also divulged that CNN plans to start hyping the climate change agenda as soon as the Covid-19 hysteria dies down, per CEO Jeff Zucker's orders.***

***...***

***Chester explained how the propaganda network used shots of Biden jogging and/or wearing hip aviator sunglasses to deflect from his advanced age and promote the idea that he was healthy.***

***"He is definitely — the whole thing of him running during the entire — like run for the campaign. Showing him jogging is obviously deflection of his age and they're [CNN] trying to make it like, 'Oh, I'm healthy,'" Chester said. "We would always show shots of him [Biden] jogging and that [he's] healthy, you***

***know, and him in aviator shades. Like you paint him as a young geriatric." [Source]***

These lies & manipulations are not confined to targeting or protecting broad policies & prominent people. They also effect the day-to-day operations & seek to undermine the very foundations of our collective society. For example, the already cracked base of our "justice" system is jack-hammered by race-obsessed fanatics seeking to fan the flames of passion. The coverage of the Chauvin trial provides an excellent example:

***"The coverage was striking in the glowing accounts of the prosecution's closing arguments as opposed to the criticism of the defense. More importantly, the coverage shows little concern over the rights of criminal defendants or appreciation for the position of defense counsel.***

***We saw the same trend during the Trump Administration when legal experts adopted ridiculously broad interpretations of criminal provisions in a blind obsession to find any way to charge Donald Trump or his family. Some of us from the defense bar warned how dangerous such interpretations would be — and how they ignored both the element and controlling case law. Legal experts dismissed abuses disclosed in prior investigations involving defendants like Michael Flynn and Carter Page. They disregarded the implications of sweeping definitions of crimes like obstruction or the Logan Act. They defended judicial bias when it worked against Trump officials.***

***The saddest aspect to this trend is that legal analysis was once largely immune from such open bias. I have worked as a television legal analyst for thirty years on various networks. I have watched as legal analysts in both television and print have become part of the echo journalism model — offering reassuring analysis for viewers who want continual reaffirmation of their own political preferences. We have now lost any semblance of objectivity or neutrality. That is consistent with the trend in journalism at large where there are growing calls for advocacy in journalism. This includes academics rejecting the very concept of objectivity in journalism in favor of open advocacy. Even Columbia Journalism Dean and New Yorker writer Steve Coll denounced how the First Amendment right to freedom of speech was being “weaponized” to protect disinformation. The result however has been the steady decline in trust for the media.” [\[Source\]](#)***

These tactics seek to replace critical thinking & analysis with emotional knee-jerk reactions. Rage promotion is the name of the game. The end result of all this is the increasing importance of appearance, or to use the political jargon: optics. Consider the case of "Senator Cancun":

***"Apparently, a certain kind of person's suffering is compounded when he knows that someone he dislikes is not suffering the same. The wall-to-wall coverage of Cruz's trip to Cancun—this non-event—was a cynical attempt to stoke the ire of those prone to this kind of vicarious suffering, the people who***

***suffer more when they know someone else is suffering less. The media, as usual, was deliberately amplifying the resentment of their audience, which in this case meant maximizing the frustrations of people negatively impacted by a weather emergency. That's a rude ploy, but it represents a growing trend in American journalism: the obsession with "optics."***

***It wasn't really that Sen. Cruz had done something wrong. It wasn't even that he hadn't done something right. It was that he did something that looked bad. The "optics" were bad, and that could be leveraged to advance political objectives that were completely unrelated to the weather in Texas. This constant weaponization of optics, something all too common in news media, reveals some troubling realities about contemporary American society and democratic governance.***

***...***

***The conventional meaning of "optics" is a field of knowledge that deals with light and vision. The Oxford English (OED) dictionary has a secondary entry with the newer meaning of the word when used as a noun: "The way in which a situation, event, or course of action is perceived by the public[,] Frequently in political contexts." The earliest known example of this usage cited in the OED (behind a paywall) occurred in the Boston Globe in 1973. That timing is important: just as new visual forms of media (television, fax***

***machines, rudimentary computing) were becoming the predominant channels for public communication, our culture and politics developed a new fixation on appearances.***

***Around this time, Marshall McLuhan (a media theorist and professor of English at the University of Toronto) became something of a sensation among the intelligentsia, as he was among the first thinkers to offer a rich description of how the changes in mass media were reinventing the social sphere. One of his most famous books (co-authored with Quentin Fiore) was *The Medium is the Message*, which explained how the dynamics and operation of a given medium of representation (television, radio, etc.) are actually more powerful than the information that they transmit to the audience.***

***According to McLuhan, any medium of communication also entails an interpretation of social reality, and enables an “extension” of that reality. That is, the mediated representation of social events controls how audiences receive those events. In turn, this conditioning of the audience’s reception of information brings about some transformation of reality because it changes how people interact with the world. It doesn’t matter so much what reality is; people’s actions are determined by how reality appears to them.***

***...***

***McLuhan and Fiore’s title is a nod to this management of perceptions: the medium is***

***“the message,” because any platform for the sharing of public information will “massage” the collective experience of that reality. They explain: “All media work us over completely. They are so persuasive in their personal, political, economic, aesthetic, psychological, moral, ethical, and social consequences that they leave no part of us untouched, unaffected, unaltered.”***

***Thus, media technology creates a doubling of reality where the world of real events is modified by a world of perceptions: there is the pre-existing, external reality to which the media refers and attempts to represent, and there is the manufactured reality that comes into being as an effect of representing that external reality. Because of the ubiquity of mediated ways of interacting with the world (where news outlets serve as middlemen that prescribe the public interpretation of events), these two realities are increasingly indistinguishable. The media takes real events (which are often of marginal concern for society and its governance) and reinvents them as public objects of concern which can then advance all manner of ideological itineraries.***

***This process of reinvention generates what Daniel Boorstin (American historian and former librarian of Congress) has called “pseudo-events” in his appropriately titled book *The Image*.***

***...***



***Like an event, a pseudo-event also works to broaden the audience of any particular happening, bringing it to the attention of people who would otherwise be unaware. With pseudo-events, however, there is a key difference: the pseudo-event refers to and represents a real event, but its reference to and representation of that event are designed to create and modify realities that are not immediately related to the event.***

***[For] example, if you were to post “Lost Dog” signs not in order to find your dog, but rather, to elicit pity from a potential romantic partner in the neighborhood, then we’d approach the realm of a pseudo-event. If that was the primary motivation behind the “Lost Dog” signs, you could very well imagine a scenario in which there was no missing dog—no dog at all. Just a guy trying to get attention. Of course, there may well be a lost dog: the event to which the pseudo-event refers is not necessarily a fiction. What’s important here is that the purpose of reclaiming the dog is decidedly secondary. Disseminating the news of the lost dog aims to achieve an external outcome (e.g., getting a date) that had nothing to do with the dog or its departure.”***

***[\[Source\]](#)***

Pseudo-events are the type of influence & analysis tools which we need to become more familiar with. Though not just to defend against their use on us. The type of thinking and strategizing involved in the creation of pseudo-events can also be used to help secure our liberation. In an ideal world of course such tools would not be acceptable in

civilized society and anyone using them for any purpose would be condemned. But we're living in a far from ideal world. We live in a world where the masses have been primed to be susceptible to exactly these kinds of manipulation operations.

So we must develop ways to utilize these tools for the emancipation of the masses' minds. This will not be an easy task. If you've read any fantasy literature at all you'll be familiar with the trope of the powerful tool that so many seek to use for good but ultimately ends up a corrupting and malevolent force. Keep in mind, as you read the following examples, that many of the people crafting these pseudo-events may in fact believe in their "rightness" in the exact same way as you do.

***"Consider the pseudo-event of Officer Sicknick's body lying in state, after the media falsely reported that he had been bludgeoned to death by protesters with a fire extinguisher. In reality, the only death directly resulting from the Capitol entry was the case of a protester who was killed by the gun of a police officer. Indeed, there were other deaths that appear to have been indirectly related to the breach of the Capitol, but those were due to peripheral causes like a heart attack, suicide, or a stroke. In the public imagination, though, the full death toll of January 6th was directly attributable to Donald Trump and his murderous supporters."***

***The media manipulation of reality is broader than simply waiting for an event that "looks bad" and using it to create a pseudo-reality to further a partisan agenda. While media***

***outlets will speak openly about “bad optics,” “good optics” also play a role, albeit a quieter one.***

***When something “looks good” for an ideological opponent of the media (that is, when the representation and dissemination of an event might advance a domestic opponent’s objectives), the event will not be represented. Thus, when video is posted to Twitter of security officials allowing protesters into the Capitol, it will quickly be discredited. Don’t believe your lying eyes. After all, it serves as an obstacle to creating the pseudo-event of the “armed insurrection.” Conversely, when something “looks good” for allies of the media (that is, when it might advance their shared partisan agenda), it will be broadcast extensively to expand the audience and visibility of the event. (Consider the wide dissemination of Ocasio-Cortez’s tearful visit to the southern border to visit the migrant “kids in cages” during the Trump administration.)***

***...***

***In a troubling passage from The Medium is the Massage, McLuhan and Fiore describe new media technologies as the greatest modern power in shaping culture, society and international affairs: “Real, total war has become information war. It is being fought by subtle electric information media—under cold conditions, and constantly. [This] cold war is the real war front [...] involving everybody—all the time—everywhere.” Whereas the***

***traditional democratic function of media is to equip the public for effective deliberation by informing them about realities pertinent to the national interest, the media now serves as a partisan weapon to undermine domestic opponents of elite ideology." [\[Source\]](#)***

It is worth returning once more to the events & coverage surrounding January 6th (and the months leading up to it):

***"That fake news can have such real world consequences should scare every American to death.***

***Notice also how the fake news story worsens with each repeat. On January 6, the alleged insurrection was by "Trump supporters." By January 23 Trump supporters had been morphed into "White supremacist insurrectionists."***

***The entire world now believes in something that does not exist.***

***This is an example of what it means to live in The Matrix. Everyone lives in a false world created by lies repeated endlessly by pressitutes.***

***The ruling lies are lies that enable Establishment agendas by getting rid of non-establishment explanations and shutting down non-establishment leaders. Trump had to go because he was in the way of Establishment agendas. An example is being made of Trump as a lesson to others who***

***value service to the people higher than service to the Establishment.***

***There is no doubt whatsoever that Trump won reelection. The accumulated evidence of electoral fraud is overwhelming. Yet the Lie Machine was able to prevent the evidence being presented and examined. All the pressites ever said was that "there is no evidence of fraud," followed by "all who support examining the evidence are enemies of democracy."***

***In other words, democracy is a stolen election. If you protest the theft, you are an enemy of democracy." [\[Source\]](#)***

If you still aren't seeing much of a problem, the vapid & vain propagandists at CNN & CBS were kind enough to provide a particularly blunt example:

***"In a headline clearly designed to prompt outrage, CNN recently claimed that "Sidney Powell argues in new court filing that no reasonable people would believe her election fraud claims." Similarly, CBS News asserted that "Sidney Powell tells court 'no reasonable person' would take her voter fraud claims as fact." The implication is that Powell, one of the most prominent critics of the 2020 presidential election, who has been outspoken in her claims that Joe Biden's victory was secured through outright fraud involving, in particular, illegal and malicious manipulation of the vote-counting machines, has now repudiated those claims.***

...

***...it is accurate that the filing by Powell's attorneys in the defamation lawsuit did assert that when Powell made her charges of election fraud involving the Dominion voting systems, she made clear that she was asserting opinion rather than fact, as her charges remained to be proved, and the evidence on which she relied for her assertions (which was spelled out in detail by Powell at the time) still had not been authenticated in a judicial setting.***

***The explanation for this seeming anomaly (that Powell believed and still believes that fraud took place and her lawyers' assertion that she was only asserting opinion) is that for Dominion to succeed in its libel case against Powell it would have to prove that she knew what she was asserting was false, and that, indeed that falsity was a matter of fact she consciously or recklessly malevolently presented as something it was not.***

***Her lawyers, in other words, were simply making a highly technical legal argument that at the time Powell made the statements in question they could only be matters of opinion, and the statement of an opinion is not a statement of fact and therefore could not be grounds for a defamation action. This is not the easiest point to grasp, but any reading of the whole pleading by anyone with legal training should have made it evident."***

***[\[Source\]](#)***

You see with the above example how some very important nuance is removed and what remains is designed to trigger specific emotions, to lead you to the "correct" conclusions, and to shut down your critical thinking abilities & encourage emotional reactions. Whether it's the Trump years or "mass shootings," the information presented to you by the media is not provided to inform but rather to make you conform.

## Reality White-Out

***"[The 1950s] was a disastrous period in American media that not only resulted in a historically repressive atmosphere of conformity, but saw all sorts of glaring social problems covered up or de-emphasized with relative ease, from Jim Crow laws to fraudulent propaganda about communist infiltration to overthrows and assassinations in foreign countries.***

***The wink-wink arrangement that big media companies had with the government persisted through the early sixties, and enabled horribly destructive lies about everything from the Bay of Pigs catastrophe to the Missile Gap to go mostly unchallenged, for a simple reason: if you give someone formal or informal power to choke off lies, they themselves may now lie with impunity. It's Whac-a-Mole: in an effort to solve one problem, you create a much bigger one elsewhere, incentivizing official deceptions.***

***That 1950s period is attractive to modern politicians because it was a top-down system. This was the era in which worship of rule by technocratic experts became common, when the wisdom of the "Best and the Brightest" was unchallenged. A yearning to return to those times runs through these new theories about speech, and is prevalent throughout today's Washington, a city that seems to think***



***everything should be run by people with graduate degrees." [\[Source\]](#)***

It's not just via emotional-manipulation that poor journalism seeks to control you...erm sorry, I meant "help you come to the right conclusions." After all, some people are becoming increasingly adept at sussing out and combating emotional manipulation in media. To really control the masses you'll need to trot out every propagandist's favorite tool: the eraser. Consider the coverage of Kamala Harris, in particular the piece referenced below. At the time of its publishing it was nothing but a simple candidate puff piece, typical of much political coverage these days. But when later circumstances turn it into a potential tool of delegitimization, out comes the eraser:

***"Here's how the first seven paragraphs of that article, published by the Post on July 23, 2019, and bylined by features reporter Ben Terris, originally appeared:***

***It was the Fourth of July, Independence Day, and Kamala Harris was explaining to her sister, Maya, that campaigns are like prisons.***

***She'd been recounting how in the days before the Democratic debate in Miami life had actually slowed down to a manageable pace. Kamala, Maya and the rest of the team had spent three days prepping for that contest in a beach-facing hotel suite, where they closed the curtains to blot out the fun. But for all the hours of studying policy and practicing the zingers that would supercharge her candidacy, the trip allowed for a break in an otherwise all-encompassing schedule.***

***"I actually got sleep," Kamala said, sitting in a Hilton conference room, beside her sister, and smiling as she recalled walks on the beach with her husband and that one morning SoulCycle class she was able to take.***

***"That kind of stuff," Kamala said between sips of iced tea, "which was about bringing a little normal to the days, that was a treat for me."***

***"I mean, in some ways it was a treat," Maya said. "But not really."***

***"It's a treat that a prisoner gets when they ask for, 'A morsel of food please,' " Kamala said shoving her hands forward as if clutching a metal plate, her voice now trembling like an old British man locked in a Dickensian jail cell. "'And water! I just want wahtahhh....'Your standards really go out the f—ing window."***

***Kamala burst into laughter." [\[Source\]](#)***

This particular example may seem minor and insignificant but that may be the most important part of all. One can almost understand attempting to hide something massive & potentially embarrassing or otherwise detrimental. But something like this is not that. Its erasure & memory-holing points to an insecurity that is deep-rooted. This insecurity has been making itself more visible in recent months.

***"Not even two months into their reign as the majority party that controls the White House and both houses of Congress, key Democrats have made clear that one of their top priorities is censorship of divergent voices. On Saturday, I detailed how their escalating***

***official campaign to coerce and threaten social media companies into more aggressively censoring views that they dislike — including by summoning social media CEOs to appear before them for the third time in less than five months — is implicating, if not already violating, core First Amendment rights of free speech.***

***Now they are going further — much further. The same Democratic House Committee that is demanding greater online censorship from social media companies now has its sights set on the removal of conservative cable outlets, including Fox News, from the airwaves.***

***The House Energy and Commerce Committee on Monday announced a February 24 hearing, convened by one of its sub-committees, entitled “Fanning the Flames: Disinformation and Extremism in the Media.” Claiming that “the spread of disinformation and extremism by traditional news media presents a tangible and destabilizing threat,” the Committee argues: “Some broadcasters’ and cable networks’ increasing reliance on conspiracy theories and misleading or patently false information raises questions about their devotion to journalistic integrity.”***

***...***

***But what House Democrats are doing here is far more insidious than what is revealed by that creepy official announcement. Two senior members of that Committee, Rep. Anna Eshoo (D-Silicon-Valley) and Rep. Jerry McNerney (D-***

***CA) also sent their own letters to seven of the nation's largest cable providers — Comcast, AT&T, Spectrum, Dish, Verizon, Cox and Altice — as well as to digital distributors of cable news (Roku, Amazon, Apple, Google and Hulu) demanding to know, among other things, what those cable distributors did to prevent conservative “disinformation” prior to the election and after — disinformation, they said, that just so happened to be spread by the only conservative cable outlets: Fox, Newsmax and OANN.***

***In case there was any doubt about their true goal — coercing these cable providers to remove all cable networks that feature conservative voices, including Fox (just as their counterparts on that Committee want to ban right-wing voices from social media) — the House Democrats in their letter said explicitly what they are after: namely, removal of those conservative outlets by these cable providers***

***...***

***For the last four years, we were inundated with media messaging that Trump posed an unprecedented threat to press freedoms. The Washington Post even flamboyantly adopted a new motto to implicitly ratify that accusation (while claiming it was not Trump-specific). Other than the indictment of Julian Assange — which most Washington Democrats cheered — what did the Trump administration do in the way of attacking press freedoms that remotely compares to Democrats abusing***

***their majoritarian power to force the removal of conservative cable outlets from the airwaves, just days after doing the same with dissident voices online?***

***There is not a peep of protest from any liberal journalists. Do any of the people who spent four years pretending to care so deeply about the vital role of press freedom have anything to say about this full frontal attack by the majority party in Washington on news outlets opposed to their political agenda and ideology?***

***...***

***Just imagine if, during the Trump years, the GOP Senate had abused its power to bully cable outlets into removing MSNBC from their platforms, or banning liberal journalists and activists from using social media platforms, on the grounds that they were spreading conspiracy theories and fake news. It is hard to overstate how extreme the rhetoric would have been that Trump and the Republicans were engaged in authoritarian measures to destroy free speech and a free press."***

***[\[Source\]](#)***

Those of us that had paid attention prior to the Trump years were able to dip into a massive archive of hypocrisy & "inconvenient" truths. We had the ability to showcase with hard evidence the duplicity of the media maggots. Even with this access & ability our efforts were resisted & their effects were limited. How much more difficult would this essential task have been operating under the conditions we find ourselves in today? What about the conditions that

seem likely to emerge should we remain on our current trajectory?

## What Lies Behind

***""Completely detached from their own nations, imbued with a global liberal ideology and driven by the desire to accumulate wealth regardless of the consequences, Western elites have become antagonistic to their own citizens whose physical existence and spiritual heritage is unreservedly sacrificed for narrow economic interests and ideological views. The reaction of the other side is expectedly negative, but slow, given that social engineering within Western countries has been conducted since the end of World War II." [Source]***

There's a trend of people defining "civilized" as offloading more and more of what would normally have been handled between people in ad-hoc, often far from perfect manners, onto a standardized bureaucratic regime. Any mistakes & failures are seized upon as reasons why more and more must be brought into fold and that the tinkering & data analysis must always increase so we can become ever more perfect. The end of the road of all this is a Transhumanist hellscape, the Final Cage.

***""One of the saddest lessons of history is this: If we've been bamboozled long enough, we tend to reject any evidence of the bamboozle. We're no longer interested in finding out the truth. The bamboozle has captured us. It's simply too painful to acknowledge, even to ourselves, that we've been taken. Once you give a charlatan power over you, you almost never get it back."***

***In 2011 there was a devastating nuclear meltdown at the Fukushima Nuclear Power plant in Japan. An “investigation” concluded that:***

***“its fundamental causes are to be found in the ingrained conventions of Japanese culture, our reflexive obedience, our reluctance to question authority, our devotion to sticking with the programme”.***

***However, there is nothing specifically Japanese about these attitudes....Why do powerful people in governments and corporations commit so many crimes? Why do people tolerate a government that commits war crimes? Why do people turn a blind eye when large corporations repeatedly carry out unethical activities? Why is it we are so easily misled?***

***...***

***Psychologists have recognised that our beliefs are an important part of how we see ourselves. We prefer to receive information that confirms our existing views or beliefs, because it makes us feel good about ourselves. Psychologists use the term ‘cognitive dissonance’ to describe a situation where people feel uncomfortable because they are presented with evidence that contradicts their existing beliefs. We try to find ways to deal with this discomfort, either by ignoring the information, or by using faulty logic to justify our existing beliefs. This is***



***known as 'confirmation bias', and is often divided into three main areas.***

***Firstly, biased search is where we actively seek out information that supports our existing views. Most newspaper readers will be aware that they choose a newspaper where the writers express similar views to their own.***

***Secondly, biased interpretation is where we interpret ambiguous evidence as supporting our existing position. We also find reasons to dismiss evidence that contradicts our beliefs, by convincing ourselves that the source was unreliable.***

***Finally, biased memory is where we remember information that supports our existing beliefs, and forget information that contradicts them. Over time, most people forget the detail of what they have learned. They create a framework of understanding, or a framework of knowledge. This is like a general overview of how we see the world. If new information is consistent with this framework, it fits into the framework easily, reinforces the framework, and might be remembered. If new information does not fit easily into the framework then we don't know what to do with it, so it will tend to be dismissed and quickly forgotten.***

***Affection for beliefs seems to be similar to affection for people. Recent research has shown that some parts of the brain are deactivated when thinking about people we love. In particular, some of the areas responsible***

***for critical thinking. The same appears to be true when thinking about beliefs. Our brain treats differently any information that might challenge our beliefs. The effect seems to be stronger for emotionally charged issues and for deeply entrenched beliefs. This is particularly the case where people believe in a powerful ideology, or a big idea, such as 'markets'. We are mostly unaware of how deeply these big ideas affect the way we think. Confirmation bias can lead to a situation where people will continue to believe something, even when it is strongly contradicted by the evidence."* [\[Source\]](#)**

I think perhaps the cure to these biases, along with authority worship, may be to actively empower people from the ground up. For example, the task of creating your own news clipping archive both provides you with a resource to use in the creation of future work and a way to help you remember information you may have forgotten.

What those in authority do seems complex but they're just weaving together a variety of simple processes to create their manipulative BS. Anyone can do what they do given the resources, but more importantly, once people can do it themselves, even on a small scale, seeing through it becomes that much easier.

A similar statement could be made for us free-thinkers as well. "Doing your own research" often seems complex and overwhelming, but all it is is simple processes that add up over time. If people can read in a critical manner (and the more they do the better they'll get) they can free themselves and begin to free others. Consider this new research on whether you can "bullshit a bullshitter":

***"For the purposes of science, the researchers define "bullsht" as information deliberately crafted to persuade or 'sell' people on an idea with little or no concern for the truth of the matter. They also divide bullsht into two subtypes: persuasive and evasive. Persuasive bullsht is designed to impress an audience and win them over, whereas evasive bullsht, as the name suggests, is designed to bamboozle them with irrelevant nonsense so as to avoid inconvenient or uncomfortable truths in a given situation or context.***

***The University of Waterloo researchers took 800 participants from the US and Canada and tested their bullshtting prowess. They compared the participants' self-reported engagement in both types of bullshtting with their take on a series of pseudoscience, fake news, and the other assorted forms of bullsh\*t everyone is subjected to online on a daily basis.***

***The participants also underwent cognitive screenings and personality tests to determine their levels of introspection and self-confidence, and their ability to reflect on their own behavior. And, as the research proved, it turns out that, contrary to popular wisdom, one can indeed bullsht a bullshtter.***

***"Persuasive BSers seem to mistake superficial profoundness for actual profoundness. So, if something simply sounds profound, truthful, or accurate to them, that means it really is,"***

***Littrell said, adding that the evasive bullsh\*tters are the ones to look out for.***

***"[E]vasive bullshitters were much better at making this distinction." [\[Source\]](#)***

So that's an angle of attack I'm currently working on: Trying to make people's current habits empowering, attempting to get them to not be passive consumers, promoting the creation of your own news archives, encouraging individuals to provide their own research & analysis, etc. And doing all this just by using simple processes that add up to something bigger. It's the type of thing schools should be doing rather than attempting to fill students up with a list of facts & concepts decided by some central planner technocrats.

***"Michael J. Fox, the third president of the United States, was responsible for establishing Presbyterianism as the state religion of the new federation after its peaceful secession from the English empire.***

***Or did he? When you read that sentence, you probably scrunched up your forehead or raised an eyebrow in disbelief. Maybe you know that Michael J. Fox is the actor who played Marty McFly in the Back to the Future movies. Maybe you know the third president of the United States was Thomas Jefferson and that on point of principle, the United States has never had a state religion. I suspect you are probably aware that its citizens fought a war to gain independence and you may know that this independence was gained from Great Britain rather than England. What I am pretty sure you did not do was attempt to look at the***

***sentence from multiple perspectives or evaluate the source.***

***The development of the capacity to think critically is an aim of education on which most of us can agree. It is a commonplace to amend a call for such a capacity to the issues of the day and so, if inclined, we may point to fake news, myths about COVID-19, and the ever-widening polarization of political debate as evidence for the urgent need to nurture critical thinking. Yet I am confident that we could justify such a call under the circumstances of any year since the advent of mass education. The need for critical thinking is not in question. Instead, the point of interest is how best to develop this capacity given that we have yet failed to do so at scale.***

***If you go to one of those conferences on education that serve a pleasing lunch then you will hear about critical thinking as a “skill.” The solution is simple—we just need to develop the capacity for critical thinking in young people by making them do critical thinking. Perhaps they could do a project about climate change (a popular choice) and as a result they will somehow—don’t bore me with the details here—kind of pick-up the ability to think critically. Perhaps we should teach them some heuristics such as, “look at the problem from multiple perspectives” or “write down a list of positive and negative points.”***

***Indeed, critical thinking is one of the “4 Cs” of the ageing 21st century skills movement, alongside creativity, collaboration, and communication. The Australian Curriculum has drawn upon these ideas in its model of “general capabilities,” one of which is “critical and creative thinking.” Unfortunately, critical thinking is not a skill that can be improved through practice—like a golf swing—nor is it a “general” capability. Instead, it is an abstract description of what humans can do as a result amassing a wealth of underpinning knowledge and skills relevant to the particular context in which thinking is to be deployed.” [\[Source\]](#)***

Building up in everyone the basic analytical skills & the foundational knowledge required to really use them effectively is key. We can't just leave these activities to a professionalized minority. Heck, these days it certainly seems things like a journalism degree should act as a disqualifier, rather than a qualification. And just like few kids, even ones who dream of playing in the NFL, are going to have much interest in spending 10-15 years doing nothing but practice & drills before they even play a real game, many will lack interest in truly developing their analytical skills & foundational knowledge without having some outlets to really test & apply themselves in the short-term.

We need to encourage more and more people to put their own ideas out there to have them critically analyzed too. Everyone's got an area they're knowledgeable about but we can't just specialize, we need to have the courage to be wrong (and we need to support others' ability to be wrong and not be mocked or shamed for it).

There's often a longing for a past version of things, and journalism proves no exception. We even saw examples of such nostalgia above. But like many instances of this kind of longing, we must determine whether it is based more on fantasy than fact. Was there a time when journalism was truly good or were there just times where it was harder to call out & show journalistic wrongness in real-time? Does the vast treasure chest history provides allow us to pick out the exceptional examples of previous eras and overshadow the far more numerous unexceptional ones?

Another problem we face in this country is this: We really can't even be certain how people are using words and what they're intending them to mean. So even something like "activist journalism" can conjure entirely different visions in people's minds. If activist journalism means journalism which often hides inconvenient facts that would distract from the narrative trying to be presented then I'm certainly against that. But if it means journalism done by people who genuinely care about the issues they're covering and who present things in a fair manner, well that's OK by me, but I'd also agree in that instance that maybe adding "activist" was unnecessary.

We're going to need to get better at probing people to achieve greater understanding of their meanings. It is essential that we do this because the lack of a clearly shared meaning is not simply confined to the meaning of words but extends deep into our societal structures:

***"The principle of tolerance, within one society, cannot coexist with the reality of completely different cultures which in some respects are even hostile to one another. Multiculturalism is used as an excuse to reject integration, but without integration and partial assimilation,***

***the wholeness of one society and state cannot be preserved."* [\[Source\]](#)**

One thing I've been pondering lately more and more is the sheer scale of the task, the absolute number of minds we must now address. Are we capable of actually uniting that many minds behind anything truly meaningful? In a strange way perhaps things like Hollywood & Disney can offer us hope: We see so many enthralled by the creations of these fantasists. And many others are on similar paths, influencing the minds of the masses.

So clearly it is not a physically impossible task. But to do it in an honest, non-manipulative manner? To do it in quick enough? To do it starting from the poor positions we find ourselves in? That I do not know. I'm concerned far too many are going to be inclined to join the side offering the shiny high-tech "fun & exciting" future. And that ain't us. But I still have hope.

***"If you do journalism well, then you're going to make people angry, and if you're making people angry, then they are going to say unpleasant and hurtful things about you. If you're lucky, that is all that will happen. The bigger your platform, the more angry people there will be, and the angrier they will be. The more powerful the people angered by your work, the more intense the retaliation. That is what it means to call someone "powerful": they have the capacity to inflict punishment on those who impede them.***

...

***Anyone who cannot endure that, or who does not want to, is well-advised not to seek out a***



***public platform and try to become an influential figure who helps shape discourse, debate and political outcomes, and especially not to become a reporter devoted to exposing secret corruption by powerful factions. It would obviously be better if all of that did not happen, but wishing that it would stop is like hoping it never rains again: not only is it futile, but — like rain — there are cleansing and healthy aspects to having those who wield influence and power have to hear from those they affect, and anger.***

***But with that cost, which can be substantial, comes an enormous benefit. It is an immense privilege to have a large platform that you can utilize to shape the society around you, reach large numbers of people, and highlight injustices you believe are being neglected. Those who have that, and who earn a living by pursuing their passion to use it, are incredibly fortunate. Journalists who are murdered or imprisoned or prosecuted for their work are victims of real persecution. Journalists who are maligned with words are not, especially when those words come not from powerful state officials but from random people on the internet."*** [\[Source\]](#)

Clearly, engaging in real journalism, especially today, is not a completely safe endeavor. These threats, both subtle and not, encourage inaction, docility, and timidity. Though I think part of the reason no one wants to act is because there's no well-defined path with a plausible & positive outcome. The talking heads, as many rightfully note, are all failures. They may have nuggets of wisdom to mine here or

there but for the most part they're just out to increase their business and maybe get some cheap rush out of having so much "influence."

***"The thesis of The Revolt of the Public is that traditional centralized powers are losing — have lost — authority, in large part because of the demystifying effect of the Internet. The information explosion undermined the elite monopoly on truth, exposing long-concealed flaws. Many analysts had noted the disruptive power of the Internet, but what made Gurri unique is that he also predicted with depressingly humorous accuracy how traditional hierarchies would respond to this challenge: in a delusional, ham-fisted, authoritarian manner that would only confirm the worst suspicions of the public, accelerating the inevitable throw-the-bums-out campaigns. This assessment of the motive for rising public intransigence was not exactly welcomed, but either way, as Kling wrote, "Martin Gurri saw it coming."***

***Gurri also noted that public revolts would likely arrive unattached to coherent plans, pushing society into interminable cycles of zero-sum clashes between myopic authorities and their increasingly furious subjects. He called this a "paralysis of distrust," where outsiders can "neutralize but not replace the center" and "networks can protest and overthrow, but never govern." With a nod to Yeats, Gurri summed up: "The center cannot hold, and the border has no clue what to do about it."***

...

***Gurri predicted throughout that entrenched authorities would be unable to distinguish between legitimate criticism and illegitimate rebellion. Once they lost control “over the story told about their performance,” they’d denounce clearly factual evidence of public discontent as lies. Gurri would later talk about centralized authority being “institutionally unable to grasp that it has lost its monopoly over political reality.” This in turn would stimulate even more “distrust and loss of legitimacy.”” [\[Source\]](#)***

Some will argue that these forces arrayed against us are too powerful to stop with anything but violence. But if our problem is there is no well-defined path then not everything left to do is illegal. That path may cross into in gray or black areas of the law at points, maybe it does not. But if that path is not walked by tens of millions with a firm belief that something better lies on the other side of the treacherous mountain pass, we won't succeed. So one of the tasks on our to-do list is to actually make that treacherous path seem worth the risk to more and more people. And some of that will look like small-time, pep rally, inspirational BS. But its necessary in a world of 8 billion minds, I think.

***“When we look at ideological movements, we see many people spreading certain ideas, perhaps zealously and dogmatically protesting in the streets with flags, banners, and sometimes violence. Some movements, peopled by thousands or millions, look like unstoppable, rock-solid juggernauts. But these intellectual “things” are in fact more***

***fluid. If we look closely, we will notice a turnover of membership and, if we cast our gaze over a longer period of time, we witness within these “juggernauts” splits and other dramatic internal disagreements. For example, when we examine the Communist Parties in the West during the 1930s, we’re at first impressed by what looks like formidable discipline, strength, and staying power. But all the time, some Communist Party members were leaving and new people were joining. Typically, in such ideological bodies of adherents, there are a few stalwarts who remain at the helm through thick and thin, while the great body of members are continually being replaced.***

***A similar phenomenon affects religious movements. In her 1989 book *New Religious Movements: A Practical Introduction*, the sociologist Eileen Barker reported that at least 61 percent of those who joined the Unification Church during a four-month period in 1978 had left within two-and-a-half years. Others have found very similar defection rates in various minor religious sects.”*** [\[Source\]](#)

The leviathan we face may in fact not be a leviathan at all. It may simply be, as wise & brave Toto showed us: a grand illusion created & controlled by a weak & insecure force. Our leviathan may be nothing but a hologram whose controllers are hidden behind a curtain we are not even supposed to notice.

Well I want you to notice that curtain. Look at it. Inspect it. And let's figure out the best way to rip that sucker down and

expose what lies behind.

*"...when you cut off other means of communication,  
stop exposing people to very different ideas, it's this  
or conflict."*

--@themorrigan1973

## 8.

# Being the Butterfly

*"That's the greater challenge, how do we make people love freedom and reject the government as a parent."*

*--@themorrigan1973*

Possessing nuclear weapons is the only way to guarantee that the US Government will not wage direct war upon your country. I wonder what the equivalent is for us average people against the elite. What might a nuclear deterrent look like at the dissident level? What if you actively attempted to operate at the scale of a butterfly flaps its wings in Bhutan and sometime later on the other side of the world a hurricane forms? Though I expect some might prefer: A gentle breeze knocks down Joe Biden.

***"To paraphrase Michael Lewis, "One of the qualities that distinguishes Americans from other people is their naive conviction that every foreigner wishes to be one of them, but even the most zealous Japanese patriot has no illusions that other peoples want to be Japanese". The Americans not only believe everybody secretly wants to be like them, they believe no nation can succeed or even progress without being like them and adopting the entire American value system. It isn't possible. There are no alternatives to the American way and, if there were alternatives, God would be displeased with them.***

***The elites in the US government and corporatocracy invented, and for 200 years promulgated, the concept of “manifest destiny”, a theological proposition that “merged religious delusion with boundless hypocrisy and racism” into a popular theory that God was entrusting Americans to rule the world. Reinhold Niebuhr wrote that what promised no end of grief was Americans’ arrogant conviction that “Providence has summoned America to tutor all of humankind on its pilgrimage to perfection”. (1) These ideas of American Exceptionalism and Manifest Destiny rest on a cornerstone of a pervasive political culture infused with the religious concept of a kind of covenant with God. “The packaging of wars of aggression, genocide and imperialism in the tattered camouflage of liberty with a Divinely-directed spin are old propaganda tricks which have been used to delude the US masses throughout the history of the country to the present moment.” To this day, most Americans fervently believe all of their nation’s unjustified and criminal wars were conducted to “make the world safe for democracy”.***

***American politicians and their allies in the military, in Hollywood, in publishing, in business and banking, deliberately created and then exploited the nationalistic loyalty of a gullible and uninformed public to shape perceptions and values on a massive scale. Americans have been programmed with religion-based politics for generations, being taught to see the world as black and white,***

***good and bad, to believe that only American virtues and values were good for mankind and would always triumph. Their fabricated historical myths taught them that they, their leaders, and their nation were moral, righteous and upright, selfless benefactors to the world, battling evil wherever it was found. Everything was distorted, based not only on misinformation but on outright deceit. America's image of itself, and its image of the world's nations and peoples, were tragically and shallowly twisted to create the narrative of American moral superiority.***

***...***

***And herein lies part of the tragedy of America, and the reason the country will eventually have to implode: the enormous disconnect between the propagandised ideology of the people and the brutal reality of the thin layer of elites that run their government and military, their corporations, banks and mass media. There is no other nation whose population has such a large gap between myth and reality, between what the people believe their government has done and what it has actually done. When the people one day put the pieces together, the US will have another revolution; I don't believe anything can prevent it. It was not for nothing that George Bush Sr. said, "If the people knew what we were doing, they would hang us in the streets". Perhaps one day soon, they will."***

***[\[Source\]](#)***



Let's examine, briefly, the label "the elite." It is interesting to ponder (and likely impossible to ever discover the "truth") the source of the label as well as if it was actually originally attempted a symbol of pride or if from the start it was used in a more mocking fashion? Or take the example of air acrobatics: How many of the people whom we might from the outside consider worthy of the elite label (in the high-ability sense) would instead reject such a claim or at the very least would never use it to describe themselves?

It's also good to keep in mind that for many people, the more you see or do something the more desensitized you will become. That works the same whether it's danger or dealing with people's problems. From farmers to doctors & nurses we've dramatically unbalanced the equation. We're putting too much on too few shoulders and it's ultimately to everyone's detriment.

***"Many of us want to be led. As children we look to our parents to protect us, to soothe our fears, to relieve us of responsibility. As adults we seek the same protection - we want powerful leaders, leaders who appear fearless and resilient.***

***Our narcissistic culture also demands that our leaders are charismatic, self-assured, and eloquent - we want leaders who can perform on the world stage.***

***And so trustingly, time after time, we relinquish our power to those grandiose individuals who covet high office, unaware that their determination - their sheer, dogged, winner-takes-all ambition, their superficial charm and seductiveness - may suggest that***

***many are psychologically unsuited to these roles."* [\[Source\]](#)**

Never forget: Perfection is unattainable. The more perfect someone or something seems the more likely it is that you are being misled.

Ultimately, regardless of the labels used, there are millions of us who see that a group of people who seek power & status for their own benefits have plagued us since we expanded beyond our small tribes. It's much easier to put the tyrant Bill in his place when there's only 10 or 100 of you. You've only got to convince a small number to bash Bill in the head with rocks. Or maybe he "accidentally" falls off a cliff. Or you just don't tell him about the big cat in the grass. But now that we are billions and so connected we find ourselves in deep trouble with this narrow-minded group of folks in control.

***"Traditional America is essentially leaderless. The colors have fallen in battle and no one has picked them up. The colonels and captains are pretending they don't see it, while the corporals and privates, who fear being overrun, are fixing bayonets.***

***Ever notice how the politicians who are reportedly "concerned" about your job being offshored are the same ones voting for the bills to offshore your job, outsourcing it to H1-B replacement worker programs, or hosting political fundraisers with offshoring and outsourcing lobbyists? Yeah, strange isn't it?***

***Just acknowledge it. Those people you sent to Washington? They're not going to save your***

***job, protect your children from Marxist indoctrination and race hustling at school, or preserve what's left of the Bill of Rights. We've outsourced our citizen responsibilities to the wrong people, and many are mistakenly still waiting for those same people to ride to the rescue.***

***...***

***Let's face it, in life there is only so much bandwidth to deal with the free citizen's voracious mortal enemy—the power-hungry, dictatorial tyrant. After working a full day or more, dealing with kids, running a business, and managing an ever-dwindling family budget, most Americans have very little time to analyze politics and governmental issues. Tech companies, with a nudge from the government, compete hard for that sliver of free time with social media and 24/7 entertainment packaged as news and commentary, also known as propaganda.***

***How are citizens supposed to deal with the authoritarian machinations of our rogue elite while balancing work, life, and crisis-of-the-moment daily drama? Simple—stop playing their game.***

***Unplug from the constant two-way stream of propaganda-down and surveillance-up. Use the internet, and its delivery mechanisms—smartphone, computer, and TV—just like any other tool. Turn it on when you need it to perform a task, and turn it off when you've completed it. Do not plug yourself into their***

***machine with always-on wearables and voice-activated assistants. Don't let the digital world enumerate every aspect of your daily life and shape your real-world associations and beliefs. Take back that sliver of free time in your life and reallocate it to citizen time—a time to exert your power by building knowledge, fostering local, real-world associations, and making your voice heard in your community.***

***...***

***The enemy attacks what it fears, and it fears an organized, independent, grassroots political movement. These independent movements are considered dangerous because they are not controlled by the party bosses and corporate donor class.***

***...***

***The regime doesn't care about things that aren't a threat to its power. Consequently, they want you focused on these frivolities that don't matter—the throwaway issues that distract from their real agenda. If you're comfortably whining about the latest men-in-girls-bathrooms outrage while ignoring the intelligence community's assessment on domestic violent extremists, then the regime is winning. If you're spending your time following Twitter spats and the latest manufactured drama, you're missing important information on things that can literally kill you.***

***People should be free to talk about whatever they want to talk about in America, but mindless middle-school arguments and political infotainment are not substitutes for tackling the real problems we face as a nation . . . and formerly free society. When it comes to reengaging and protecting the Constitution, when it comes to resisting authoritarian factions within government and society, we need to be serious—and focus forward on the agenda and actions that will lead to victory and to the restoration of a free constitutional republic. Be the reaper!"***  
***[\[Source\]](#)***

I think perhaps the cure to authority worship may be to actively empower people from the ground up. What those in authority do seems complex but they're just weaving together a variety of simple processes to create their manipulative BS. Anyone can do what they do given the resources, but more importantly, once people can do it themselves, even on a small scale, seeing through it becomes that much easier.

*"Folks have some great thoughts and ideas gained from their experiences. The American culture is built on a propagated narrative, which is crumbling right now. Synthesis of ideas going forward is important. I'm extremely skeptical of the intellectual community in this endeavor as they often live in a disconnected dystopia (virtual reality of sorts) of books, films, games, second hand intellectualized knowledge, not that gained from real world experience. The reason I write is to poke the intellect of everyone and drive a new functional narrative, rather than this broken social contract*

*that we accept in ignorance. Freedom is not easy on so many levels. To everyone, thank you for your cogent thoughts, time and effort. My mission is simple, . . . Find a guiding philosophy for freedom that can not be usurped by greed. Peace."*

*--@[robertemmet](#)*

The reason Antifa and BLM and other movements can gain such popularity with the youth is because the youth are purposeless and adrift. These movements provide them with the opportunity for meaning & importance. They provide a story which the youth can be the heroes of. The modern professionalized world has largely taken away all opportunities to be heroic. Broken families and precarious jobs have limited the time available for intergenerational knowledge transfers. But the needs aren't gone...the need to feel important, valued, wanted, etc. Those needs are all still there. If you want to break the grip on the minds of the youth, here's a good place to start.

***"...the dark forces of the Global Cabal, the Deep State, has plunged humanity - all 193 UN member states at once, into a global catastrophe of epic proportions. To break that globalist spell and to get out of the disaster still unfolding, the world needs thinking people, courageous people, informed and awakened people; people who are not afraid to swim against the stream, to stem the ever-increasing flow of misinformation and government and media lies. It takes educated people. It takes people who dare to resist.***

***We are experiencing today just the contrary. The minute global elite that has taken a covid-***

***stranglehold on the world's 7.8 billion people, is doing everything to keep our children, the generations that are supposed to lead the world and humanity into a bright future, uneducated, scared, socially unfit to communicate, to take initiatives, to lead. Today's youth is depressed by this constant fear propaganda, by the authorities (sic) rules of confinement, not being able to see their friends, to play with them, communicate with them, to do the healthiest social activities there are - exchanging ideas with peers, acquaintances and friends.***

***One might think, there is a purpose behind it all. Could it be, that this minute diabolical Globalist Cabal, those who are behind "The Great Reset", co-authored by the WEF's founder and CEO since the NGO's creation in 1971, Klaus Schwab - could it be that these people have a plan, namely to leave the world to a generation of uneducated, fear-indoctrinated people, who are used to and have been trained to follow orders, obey authorities and believe their very leaders' (sic) lies and fall for their manipulations?"***

***[\[Source\]](#)***

This far removed from early human cultures, it is difficult to determine the distinctions between human nature and what has become dominant cultures. Is invention & discovery in our very soul? Or were they just the kinds of things the cultures that were successful at conquering others were inclined towards? Obviously humans are curious, but not all of us feel the need or see the value in constant technological "progress."

"Doing your own research" often seems complex and overwhelming, but all it is is simple processes that add up over time. If people can read in a critical manner (and the more they do the better they'll get) they can free themselves and begin to free others.

Though keep in mind that on any journey you'll experience times of disillusionment. You'll just want to stop. If it's an option you'll just want to go home. But how many times have you felt the same way? And how many times was just going home the best answer? It's normal to feel this way, everyone does, some talk about it and some don't. So take a minute, remember why you started, and let's keep going.

There is something to be said about "overthinking it" however. Ask many after, if they knew what they did now before they started, would they? Those that are honest will often answer "No." So some people simply avoid thinking about this altogether. Others become overwhelmed by it. But perhaps a few will see possibilities in the potential problem.

Our culture encourages everyone to try to be the hero, the main character, the center of the story. But the supporting characters, especially in our non-Hollywood world, are the most important of all. For example, a just-the-facts reporter provides solid information for more artistic & subjective creations to be made. But without the just-the-facts foundations being offered, the more subjective & artistic writers are stirring emotions using fictions & fabrications, an extremely dangerous situation.

***"Consider a scenario in which we're on a ship that's sinking, and the lifeboats have been launched. Being some of the last still on board the doomed vessel, we can scan who's in each***



***lifeboat and choose which one we'll clamber into.***

***It's a consequential decision because the currents and weather are already separating the lifeboats, and so each lifeboat will be on its own. The seas are increasingly treacherous, and the nearby islands are surrounded by reefs which could shred the lifeboat's hulls in seconds.***

***While we don't know everyone on board, we've met many of the other passengers and crew and made the acquaintance of a fair number of our fellow castaways.***

***So who do we choose to join? Our knowledge is imperfect: we only have first impressions and intuitions about the people who will potentially impact our life in a very direct and consequential way.***

***Do we choose to go in the lifeboat with a friend? This is certainly more appealing than a boat full of strangers.***

***Do we choose a boat with an experienced sailor whose skills in the open ocean would improve our chances of surviving the ordeal ahead?***

***Or do we choose a boat which is already under the control of a natural leader? If we understand that dithering and unresolvable conflicts can lead to disaster by default, then having someone in charge might be worth the***

***risk that their leadership will lead to a catastrophically bad decision.***

***If we feel we have the experience to take charge and bring a lifeboat to safety, then perhaps we look for the disorganized, leaderless boat.***

***Alternatively, we can weed out those boats we'll avoid as potentially dangerous because of the presence of domineering individuals with traits that have poor survival outcomes.***

***...***

***The boats I would avoid are those with wealthy, powerful people who confuse their position and wealth with competence, when actually there is no connection to competence beyond whatever specialized niche they used to acquire wealth and power. Their assumption (a form of privilege beneath the surface) that their specialized competence grants them universal competence is disastrously wrong-headed.***

***...***

***Boats filled with self-important, self-absorbed people I would avoid as death traps. I would also avoid boats with do-gooders / would-be saints whose motivation (above self-preservation, until it's too late) is to defend the rights of the weak as the most important principle, even in life-and-death circumstances. These types are especially dangerous because their life experience is that Somebody Will Rescue Us. They thus***

***conclude we can devote asymmetric resources to the weakest because Somebody Will Rescue Us.***

***They are incapable of recognizing the difference between making the vulnerable/dependent as comfortable as possible given the resources available and devoting the primary effort to saving everyone but if this can't be done, then saving as many people as possible. They are unable to recognize the need for difficult decisions that may well have asymmetric outcomes for the individuals on the boat. In demanding equal outcomes, they will lose everyone's lives--an outcome that is certainly equal but foolish.***

***...***

***I would look for a boat with low-key individuals with high situational awareness and experience in responding to crises and danger. Combat veterans come to mind, but there are many others with training and experience (or natural abilities) that aids their situational awareness, risk assessment and responses to rapidly evolving threats. The OODA loop (Observe, Orient, Decide, Act) is an example of this process.***

***I would also look for a boat with the increasingly rare individuals who do what they say they're going to do, and do it without self-obsessed drama/trauma or childish excuses. These individuals have a healthy awareness of their own limits and the limits of human***

***nature. They don't overpromise to make themselves larger than they really are and they won't burden the rest of the boat with their self-absorbed histrionics or adolescent excuses."* [\[Source\]](#)**

Many aren't ready to lead themselves. And any collapse likely empowers wannabe warlords, many of whom might implement additional rounds of dissident cleansing, cheered on by their new subjects. I'm not sure though how much of the leadership problems stem from actual incompetence or induced helplessness. And of course it will also depend on the individual personality. Though we do see in times of crisis many stand up and organize themselves. Does the crisis simply give them a license to act they don't feel they have in normal life? If so that would be an important piece to keep in mind as we approach how to resolve this lacking of leadership ability.

It's certainly a frustrating experience. If you can see the problems, the inaction & apathy are just intolerable at times. And oh how much easier it would have been to fix decades ago, before the technological advancements, the additional years of decay & decline, and when there were just fewer of us overall to convert. I think even those of us who are ready see that there's no worthwhile plan. And, there's no powerful interests that would align with a real people's revolution, unlike the massive benefits received by BLM & Antifa. For many the best outcome they'd be hoping for would just be a collapse, everyone loses and then we all get to play king of the hill of rubble.

It's part of why I'm trying to do things like Sketch-A-Society, to get people thinking far more deeply about WHAT they want to see so that then we can attempt to use these more

concrete visions to form the outline of a path people might be willing to attempt walking, despite its treacherousness.

Us, the current living generations, are probably the last ones to have to deal with it. We win or its the Final Cage (and eventually no more humans). People can take that framing as glass half-full or half-empty as they see fit.

***"As Hermann Goering famously explained regarding how to lead a country to war (and the principle holds true for any big transition, like the one we are experiencing currently):***

***"[T]he people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger."***

***...***

***...Global capitalist governments and their corporate media mouthpieces are telling us, in no uncertain terms, that "objection to their authority" will no longer be tolerated, nor will dissent from their official narratives. Such dissent will be deemed "dangerous" and above all "false." It will not be engaged with or rationally debated. It will be erased from public view. There will be an inviolable, official "reality." Any deviation from official "reality" or defiance of the "civil authorities" will be labelled "extremism," and dealt with accordingly.***

***This is the essence of totalitarianism, the establishment of an inviolable official ideology and the criminalization of dissent. And that is what is happening, right now. A new official ideology is being established. Not a state ideology. A global ideology. The "New Normal" is that official ideology. Technically, it is an official post-ideology, an official "reality," an axiomatic "fact," which only "criminals" and "psychopaths" would deny.*** [\[Source\]](#)

If I had a magic button that could "poof" away all the top elites in an instant nothing much would change if I pressed it. Other than maybe people freaking out over 3,000 people just vanishing at the same moment. If you do find yourself in possession of such a magic button you may want to craft some sort of religion which that freak out could feed into.

The elites can do nothing without many many thousands more. Slaves is certainly a reasonable term to use. But its not just their bodies which have been chained, it's their minds & foundational beliefs as well. So removing the figureheads will not necessarily change the minds of the next level lower that was tasked with the real implementation of these agendas. It would only replace the figureheads with less well-known figureheads.

We would also be wise to remember that even during so-called "slave rebellions" there were numerous slaves who picked up arms to defend their masters.

Just as we can't defeat radical Islam by killing Bin Laden or Baghdadi, we can't defeat these people with assassination. Bill Gates, Klaus Schwab, and the like are just carriers for the real virus which infects far more than the core elite. The idea of perfection, that we can end all tragedy, that we can

redesign what nature has made in ways more convenient for ourselves, etc. These are the beliefs which the elite can tap into to manipulate the masses. And it is these ideas which must be made into bugsplats on the windshield of history. We do that and Bill Gates is just some old powerless prick.

***"OK, before somebody calls me a "conspiracy theorist," GloboCap is not a bunch of guys in a room conspiring to do all this. Global capitalism is a system. Systems function according to their own structures and logic. What I'm talking about is not individual people conspiring (although individual people certainly do, and that is part of it). I'm talking about the logical evolution of a global-hegemonic ideological system, i.e., a system without external enemies, which has nothing left to do but consolidate power and eliminate internal resistance. If you understand the last 5-6 years (actually the last 30 years) that way, as I do, this shift to a less democratic, more ideologically monolithic, more totalitarian social structure (i.e., the "New Normal") is not at all surprising. On the contrary, it is the next logical step." [\[Source\]](#)***

Everything orbits around the manipulations of elites throughout history I think. I do try to avoid going too far down the "secret societies controlling the world" rabbit hole while I'm doing it as it's usually a far less organized affair than that. Spending too much time trying to fit certain Hollywood tropes into an analysis of reality is a good way to ultimately end up looking foolish and wasting efforts.

But it's also always good to remember that the tricks to sell you soap or make you connect with a fictional character can

be used to influence you in the real world. So just because you've paid far more attention to pop culture than politics up until now doesn't mean you can't provide valuable contributions. You'll lack important context but you'll also be intimately familiar with many of the tricks & tropes which are used to create false realities.

The same playbook throughout history is used by the elites to divide the numerically superior masses. The propaganda plays are just simplistic templates patched together. It's mad-lib manipulation. Looking at the immense influence wielded across a broad array of topics its clear this works very well. All that money backing it certainly doesn't hurt either.

The entire system is propped up by nothing but words repeated & amplified by organized elite systems. The more people see this, and the more they are offered simple yet effective ways to begin to create something massive, the sooner we achieve our liberation. Because its so simple, and because it works so well, anyone can do it with varying degrees of success. Since we have the superior numbers theoretically we can override any storyline if we can get enough people to utilize simple methods that eventually add up to something big.

We need to become much better at determining what's the will of the people and what's the manufactured will of the people. Let's maybe get close to a "third rail" here and briefly discuss religion. Religion fills a very real need people have. It's certainly been exploited for ill ends. The past 12 months though provides us with an excellent example of what is often portrayed as religion's opposite (science) being used for ill ends. Humans always seem to treat one category of ideas as divine. For much of history this was religion but increasingly we've replaced it with science.



***"How could people even countenance a term like lockdown, with its overtones of imprisonment and total control, let alone coming to think well of it and condemning and shaming its violators and critics? My argument was that societies like Canada had, for a long time, been "practicing" - we'd already turned the concepts on which our pandemic policies have been founded into common sense.***

***These concepts include risk, safety, pro-active management, science as a mighty oracle speaking in a single authoritative voice, and above all, Life, as a quantum to be preserved at all costs. Gradual naturalization of these concepts has made the policy that has been followed seem so rational, so inevitable, and so entirely without alternative that it has been possible to freely vilify its opponents and largely exclude them from media which might have made their voices politically influential. But knowing this doesn't make it any easier to swallow. What has come into stark relief during the pandemic may have been already latently there, but to see it actualized as the outline of a new social order is still a compelling and somewhat frightening experience....***

***...***

***If Illich and Agamben are right, the truly powerful churches - the ones that tell us not only how we ought to live but how we must live - exert their claims on us in the name of education, health, safety, risk reduction and other shibboleths of the new religion. It***

***follows that we now need what Illich's dear friend, the American critic Paul Goodman, called a "new reformation." The freedoms for which the first Reformation fought must now be fought for again.*** [\*\[Source\]\*](#)

So it seems the problem is more the unquestioning acceptance of an ideology rather than the "kind" of ideology it is. Some may say unquestioning acceptance is a hallmark of the major religions today. They wouldn't necessarily be wrong (though I don't think they're exactly right either, believers display quite the diversity) but they're also only arguing that those particular implementations of the religious impulse are flawed. And it would be important again to point out here that "secular" government & organizations have been used for ill ends based on little to no "facts" or "reality".

Atheists often mock believers for their faith. But to dismiss so easily what is a source of immense strength & resilience for so many worldwide seems quite foolish. Leaving someone unmoored in the modern world is often a recipe for misery. Yet it is not all rainbows, unicorns, and gumdrops in the Faith camp either. How we reconcile this is one of humanity's most important questions that remains unanswered.

*"...many of the people we consider "intellectuals" seem more to be "intellectualizing" where they take incorrect or hollow conclusions and support them with words that sound smart but have no depth or meaning."*

[\*--@laochspiorad\*](#)

Who is actually qualified for leadership? Our society often deems those with the proper paperwork to be qualified. But

this is only one kind of qualification to look at, and it doesn't necessarily end up selecting the best leaders. Consider ACB's \$2 million book advance: There are likely tens of millions of people considered unqualified for a role on the Supreme Court that would reject things like this book deal. But those kind of folks just don't rise very high up the ladder in this country. And that's one of our biggest problems I think.

People engaged & focused on real work don't usually rise as fast or as high as those focused on appearances. The higher up you rise in anything the more in a bubble you tend to get. Get high enough in powerful enough professions & institutions and most of the time your needs will be catered to simply because of your status. And in all other instances you'll have ample wealth to ensure your needs are catered to. This tends to make people dumber and thus more dangerous given the power they wield.

To put it a bit more crudely: The selection process weeds out all the non-sociopaths and if one of the sociopaths goes a little soft there's always some "crazy lone gunman" to take them out...or maybe they find some child pornography.

Thankfully we do see pockets of resistance popping up everywhere. However what I do not see much of yet are the stories which can provide the framework for their individual struggles to fit into larger ones. BLM had this with their corporate propaganda arms and we see the resulting organization and what it has achieved in relatively little time. They also had theories incubated within the university systems to employ as well.

Of course BLM's path also shows the hazards of using the corporate propaganda arm & university systems. So not only will we need local grassroots actions but we'll also need

more grassroots narrative makers across the country (and the world really) who can begin to generate that loud roar necessary for any real, revolutionary change.

***"The purpose of the universities, in the view of these industrialists and bankers, was to develop by indoctrination a kind of management elite capable of controlling society in a way most useful to the top 1%. By the end of the First World War, the world was in the throes of a massive industrialisation as well as urbanisation, creating social stresses from problems of inequality and civil rights, with social unrest already a growing problem. To deal with this, American universities developed (under the tutelage of Lippman and Bernays) what they called the "social sciences" like sociology and psychology with the objective of producing a cadre of "social engineers and technicians" to address these issues and control American society. The 'secret government' believed that psychology, with the techniques so skillfully applied by Bernays, could "be instrumental for attaining democratic social order and control". The theory was that individuals in society were not "well adjusted" and that propaganda could be used to appropriately "adjust" them. From this point, with the educational system as a major instrument, the US transitioned into a society of social engineering and control, using Bernays' methods directly upon primary, high school and university students to form and manipulate public perceptions and beliefs in a manner most useful to the secret government and the multi-nationals***

***they controlled. Neither the good of the nation nor the welfare of its citizens were listed as priorities. Of course, education itself became diseased and corrupted by these measures.***

***...***

***The elite 1% founded not only universities but the Foundations that exist to this day, and for the same purposes of social control. Institutions like the Rockefeller, Ford and Carnegie Foundations, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Trilateral Commission, were primarily created “to perpetuate predatory wealth through the control of information and the sources of information”, and quickly assumed missions of direct influence and control of the mindsets of many of the world’s leaders, or at least influential individuals. The Rockefeller Foundation has been pre-eminent in an astonishing array of social control initiatives that included population control in the real sense through sterilisation and war. And both the Rockefeller and Carnegie institutes funded and promoted the practice of eugenics, Carnegie recommending a national chain of gas chambers to eliminate the socially (and ideologically) unfit.***

***...***

***All the so-called Foundations and Think Tanks established during the past century shared the purpose of steering society and social thought into desirable channels, and executing massive schemes of social engineering, eventually corrupting the***

***educational system and co-opting all emerging social movements for the benefit of Bernays' 'secret government. American society, primarily through the educational system and the use of the new social sciences was being almost totally re-created to serve its ultimate masters.***

***A memo from the Rockefeller historical archives revealed a concern that their purposes might become public knowledge and be "misinterpreted" since public opinion would naturally be violently opposed to such secret programming. Senators and Congressmen rightly feared these Foundations were dangerous to their society and form of government, and recommended their abolition, but the elected portions of the government have never had the power to control the secret government. The US Congress stated that these foundations, with their wealth and influence, were "a grave menace to the welfare of society" and would be used not only to affect and control the government but to change its form. And try to change its form they would.***

***...***

***Now, the offspring of Lippman and Bernays are spending huge money on psychologists and psychiatrists to fathom precisely what it is about going to a Starbucks or a Wal-Mart that can create a "positive emotional response". Yes, I know. I almost choked writing that sentence, but these people are serious. They want to identify the underlying***

***stimuli and then fabricate the circumstances in an attempt to provoke that response. If successful, the fake commodity and fake service can disappear to be replaced by a fake emotional experience that you will treasure and one day excitedly relate to your grandchildren. It is all a false reality created with contrived experiences that are not real, but Americans are already on international speaking tours proselytising the new marketing approach. And it's all fake, in the same way that most of America is fake. Americans promoting this new view seem unable to recognise that any part of their new bible contrasts with reality, and react with offense when Europeans tell them "You Americans are all about image instead of reality. Everything about you is fake and superficial. You people are living in a cliché."***

***...***

***In summation, we have a grand conspiracy by a relative handful of people to manipulate and control the perceptions and beliefs of an entire nation of people, entirely for perverted purposes. Perhaps the word 'conspiracy' is inaccurate, since these categories of players were in some sense acting independently or at least in different spheres such as advertising and media control or education and politics, but the net result is not different from what would have occurred had there been a tightly-organised conspiracy. Certainly, each knew what the other was doing, and would have been fully aware of the effects of their combined efforts. If we connect these dots, we***

***have the European Jewish bankers and their many huge corporations, and the wealthy US elites exercising enormous control over the US government and effectively taking full charge of American education, of banking and the economy, of industrial production and, most important of all, of the mental and emotional content of the American people.***

***In every case, there was no concern for the good of the people or of a nation, no value placed on human lives, the human experience, or the human environment. It was only about the money to be derived from social control. Lippman and Bernays are gone, but their mainstay of immoral, manipulative and deceptive practices is as virulent as ever. As Shakespeare told us in Julius Caesar, "The evil that men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones".*** [\[Source\]](#)

And when put so simply it is crystal clear that we're not being offered a better alternative than the system of "rule by the 1%" they claim to be against. They're just doing what failed "people's revolutions" have done throughout history: replace one elite group with another.

***"The U.S. Marines pride themselves on making leaders—at all levels. One of a Marine leader's primary missions is taking care of their Marines. Taking care of your Marines doesn't mean making life rosy and easy for them. It means looking out for their welfare, giving them meaningful work, being direct with appropriate guidance, and holding them***



***accountable for their actions. Maybe there's a lesson here."*** [\[Source\]](#)

I can't shake the feeling that essentially all prominent people are just in it for themselves. They lack a certain simplicity & humility. It's part of why I would like to build up average people. It's really hard to get a huge head when it's clear from the start you're just applying extremely simple processes that anyone can do and after that it's just "energy over time."

The frameworks we need already exist. They're scattered, imperfect, some are in need of significant tweaking. These ideas need to be brought together outside the stifling realms of academia and brought into the public squares. It's only through actual engagement by tens of millions of average people that any of these important questions we face can be answered in ways that benefit us all. Leaving it up to "experts" will ensure the continued misrule of a narrow-minded few.

***"Who will lead the deplorables' exodus from the bondage that the political-corporate-cultural oligarchy imposes on America? The power that the oligarchy has gathered since 2015 pales by comparison with the resentment it created thereby, and the wave of public opinion that is building against it.***

***America's deplorables, clingers, irredeemables, chumps, dregs, neanderthals, etc.—persecuted, increasingly prosecuted for being on the wrong side of the oligarchy—yearn for political leaders to rescue their way of life. Demand is so high because most self-proclaimed conservative leaders talk the***

***voters' talk, but walk the big donors' oligarchic walk.***

***...***

***Subtracting Americans from the oligarchy's oppressions requires using one's powers—as governor, senator, indeed as anyone with access to an audience—to personify and organize any number of tasks, neither minimizing exposure nor mincing words. Standing against the madness of transgenderism, flying in the face of the most objective truths, may well be the easiest of these....***

***...***

***The point is clear, however. To lead the deplorables is to meet their sociopolitical needs."*** [\*\[Source\]\*](#)

Build your communities and figure out how to integrate them into the larger whole after & with the new knowledge you've gained in the process. You need no credentials to do this. Just a healthy dose of humility and the ability to laugh at what a fool you once were. Keep those two things with you throughout your life and you'll be led astray far less than those that do not.

The hardest part of this project is likely to be teaching & encouraging people to question everything including you. This is something that many people often overlook for a variety of reasons. But it's the absolute best chance to really make the habit of challenging authority stick. There can be no exceptions.

*"CRT or simply CT seeks to unravel narratives and allow people to be critical of all sides of an issue. Not bad on the face, but it admits that it plays with language. That makes it a system that works well for deconstructing a fictional narrative.*

*...*

*My larger takeaway being exposed to it at a lightly academic level is this, they mean to deconstruct first the children, then the society, the institutions (that they overtake and wear like skin suits) and then the entire system.*

*If you can pick something apart from all sides what is true at the end? The new dark age is what they aim to reproduce."*

*--@themorrigan1973*

I like to play with these ideas and tools as well, though thankfully I have avoided any sort of real indoctrination in the method and instead am attempting to re-purpose or create echoes of the more "academic" versions. I do like the increase in the possibility of "serendipitous realizations" that come about when given more license to explore alternate meaning and view, but it's always important not to descend too far down into the realm of narcissism & "my truth."

I see the basic underlying tools as equivalent to a gun. You can free yourself from tyranny or you can cause immense tragedy, all with the same simple tool. The most vocal proponents of these tools today certainly seek a new dark age. But I think there's openings for us to use their greater energy to advance towards our ultimate emancipation.

*"If our society is founded on fictions, which it is, tearing them down only helps if we have a secure platform on which to land and bring others along with us."*

*--@themorrigan1973*

Our society does rest on a foundation of fictions built up over the years. Analyzing these fictions is certainly essential to figuring out where we need to go, as well as how we got here. Complete deconstruction & destruction of some of these fictions is likely needed. What rises in its place depends in large part on the groundwork we lay now, both in terms of attempting to create a framework of an alternate story, something to avoid descent into a Dark Age, and also instilling within people the basic analytical habits & skills which can also be useful to deconstruct the fictions spewed forth from all camps.

With the benefit of hindsight it is quite clear that it was a bad idea to stand by as people who felt penned in by certain societal values began flocking to metropolitan areas which created the vast majority of the country's culture. Encouraging people to purchase so much of what once required the building & maintaining of relationships was probably unwise as well.

***"In every age, we find ourselves wrestling with the question of how Jesus Christ—the itinerant preacher and revolutionary activist who died challenging the police state of his time, namely, the Roman Empire—would respond to the moral questions of our day.***

***For instance, would Jesus advocate, as so many evangelical Christian leaders have done***

***in recent years, for congregants to “submit to your leaders and those in authority,” which in the American police state translates to complying, conforming, submitting, obeying orders, deferring to authority and generally doing whatever a government official tells you to do?***

***What would Jesus do?***

***...***

***Jesus—the revolutionary, the political dissident, and the nonviolent activist—lived and died in a police state. Any reflection on Jesus’ life and death within a police state must take into account several factors: Jesus spoke out strongly against such things as empires, controlling people, state violence and power politics. Jesus challenged the political and religious belief systems of his day. And worldly powers feared Jesus, not because he challenged them for control of thrones or government but because he undercut their claims of supremacy, and he dared to speak truth to power in a time when doing so could—and often did—cost a person his life.***

***Unfortunately, the radical Jesus, the political dissident who took aim at injustice and oppression, has been largely forgotten today, replaced by a congenial, smiling Jesus trotted out for religious holidays but otherwise rendered mute when it comes to matters of war, power and politics.”*** [\*\*\*\[Source\]\*\*\*](#)

Principles & morals can certainly help you achieve revolutions (and summon the courage necessary to attempt them) but they alone will not cut it. You must have the wisdom to know when to act and when to not. This can at times be a quite difficult task. Anger & rage at continued injustice can make even a wise individual less so.

Changing the world takes dirty hands not suits & ties. The plan never survives first contact with the enemy. Or something like that. It's hard for many people to recognize that the real answers to "How are you going to accomplish that?" often can't be provided. Nothing remains static as you attempt to change things. So really what's most necessary is good opening moves and the ability to then improvise and use your opponent's strengths & attacks against them.

The problem is we don't select for that skill set when it comes to choosing our leaders. Sure, we get many leaders adept at manipulation but that's not the same thing. Manipulation is a selfish act, it can't be used to promote the common good because it poisons everything it touches.

***"According to the American Declaration of Independence, people enter into political society for the sake of protecting their inalienable rights, which are otherwise insecure. The question then arises: what can the people do if the government betrays its trust, and violates their rights? The Declaration's initial answer is "that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government."***

***The people create the government, but in so doing they do not forfeit their right to vindicate their own rights, even against the very government they created. Thus James Wilson asserted that the “vital principle” of America is “that the supreme or sovereign power of the society resides in the citizens at large; and that, therefore, they always retain the right of abolishing, altering, or amending their constitution.” This right supersedes the claims of the government to the loyalty and obedience of its subjects. Federalist 28 describes the right of revolution as “that original right of self-defence, which is paramount to all positive forms of government.”***

***...***

***The natural law, as America’s Founding Fathers understood it, is simply that portion of the law of God that could be discerned through unassisted reason, without reference to any particular revelation. Alexander Hamilton noted that the natural law was “an eternal and immutable law, which is, indispensably, obligatory upon all mankind, prior to any institution whatever.” The natural law is a standard of political right that transcends the constitutions and statutes of particular regimes. This means that it can be used as a basis for evaluating the actions of governments and rulers, and any such that violate the natural law are to that extent immoral and unjust.***

***The natural law provides a higher-law foundation for resistance to oppression, giving such resistance a moral validity that it could not possess otherwise....***

***...***

***The existence of a natural right of revolution does not, however, mean that the exercise of this right is justified in every circumstance. The Declaration's treatment of the right of revolution continues with the assertion that "Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes." Revolution can have the most catastrophic consequences. One need only look to the other two great modern revolutions to witness this. The French Revolution moved from its moderate opening phase to the repression and mass murder of the Jacobins, and ultimately traded the Bourbon monarchy for Napoleon's empire. The Revolution unleashed more than 20 years of constant warfare on Europe, killing millions in the process. The Russian Revolution swiftly descended into Bolshevik tyranny and the unending terror of Stalin's regime.***

***The explosive danger of revolution, and the catastrophic effect a revolution can have on ordinary lives, thus require a high bar for the exercise of this right. The Declaration asserts that revolution is justified only "when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism"; in***



***these circumstances, "it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new guards for their future security."***

***...***

***Even then, revolution may not be the appropriate response. The odds of success may be so doubtful, or the likelihood of increased human misery so great, that revolution should be avoided even though the technical right exists. Two years before Howard, John Tucker told his congregation that "tho' it may not always be prudent and best, to resist such power, and submission may be yielded, yet that the people have a right to resist, is undeniable." The ruler may be so powerful, or his opponents so weak, that an ill-conceived revolution may be doomed to failure and merely worsen the condition of the people. In such a case, the revolutionaries would be guilty of a great crime against those whom they sought to liberate.***

***Under the right circumstances, however, revolution is not only a right but a duty. When the train of abuses is long, and the people are clearly being crushed into servitude, and those who would resist have a reasonable chance of success, revolution becomes an obligation. In the aftermath of the battles at Lexington and Concord, the Second Continental Congress announced, in the language of duty, its intention to resist British oppression with armed force: "Honour, justice,***

***and humanity, forbid us tamely to surrender that freedom which we received from our gallant ancestors, and which our innocent posterity have a right to receive from us." In America, in the mid-1770s, the right and the moment converged." [\[Source\]](#)***

Any would-be leaders would be wise to keep in mind that even if an act is undeniably morally right, it may be a mistake from a tactical or strategic standpoint. Whether that matters is up to you to decide. People who acknowledge this can help steer others away from rash actions. People who ignore this only create more frustrations, which lead to more rash actions.

***"...Only when the land, people and treasure are all exhausted does the promise of total victory fade, and the factions seek some negotiated settlement that leaves whatever power they still have intact lest they lose everything.***

***...The eventual settlement could have been reached in the initial stages of disorder, but the leaders of the factions were too myopic, too confident in their own judgment and power, too greedy for more and too hubris-soaked to appreciate their own weaknesses and the immense pitfalls ahead.***

***If you don't discern any of these dynamics in the present, what are you choosing not to see?" [\[Source\]](#)***

There are currently people in this world who can act with impunity. They can get away with doing horrible things. But

getting outraged over any particular injustice is usually not the most helpful course of action. There's certainly occasions where outrage has sparked reform (or at least seemed to) but simply bringing attention to something and then channeling that rage into more logical work is the only way you will have any chance of preventing these things in the future. The library is often better than the streets if you want to defeat the elites.

***"It is considerably less painful to learn from the mistakes of others than from your own, and it is less costly to learn from the successes of others, versus your own trial and effort. As we consider how to resist the looming effort of the authoritarian Left to transform our system of republican self-governance into an autocratic unitary state, we should examine the experiences of other resistance movements....***

***...***

***"Train. Equip. Lead." That is an effective mantra for managing a resistance movement.***

***Train the movement to collectively achieve a unified political goal/agenda. A movement built on a coalition that retains myriad competing political objectives is easily divided and destined to fail. Include workshops on how to properly conduct political actions, how to deal with mass surveillance, and what to do when members are detained, arrested, or facing state-sponsored violence.***

***Equip your people with the skills and resources to survive and navigate the***

***struggle. If you do not build a support network to protect and care for your movement's members, you are effectively using them as cannon fodder—and they will quickly see that. They then become vulnerable to the enemy's blacklisting, information operations, and intelligence collection efforts.***

***Lead them, protect them, and appreciate their sacrifice. A political movement that is centered around a personality is a cult or a grift. A legitimate political movement should never be about the leader, it should always be about the people.***

***...***

***Americans are searching for a path to victory over the coming authoritarian leviathan, but there are few, if any, individuals emerging in conservative and independent political circles to provide guidance or leadership. Soon, Americans will have to decide whether they are going to fight or submit to the will of the ruling elites. If they choose to fight, they would be wise to examine the history of other political movements and the resulting lessons learned at the edge of liberty and tyranny."***

***[\[Source\]](#)***

Solitude is fantastic for gaining deep insights. But you've got to come out of the wilderness eventually in order to make those insights truly useful.

Other writers have used this analogy. It works well. It goes something like this: There's a door. It's not even locked. You're just told to not go near it and maybe that bad things

lie behind it. Just to be safe, don't even look at it. It might as well not exist as far as you're concerned. Well I've been through that door. It's not all unicorns, rainbows, and gumdrops. It's certainly no utopia. But there's the potential for true liberty behind that door.

So I'm going to hold that door open. I'm going to scream "Look at this door!" I'll find things to jam in the gap. I'll start a bonfire so that the door will glow in the dark. But I'm not special. There's nothing I can do that you can't do (better?). And since this door is metaphorical, we don't even need to hold the same one.

Attempts to truly explain what lies beyond that door always fall short. But then again, we've never been really adept at using words to accurately reflect experience. Can you ever adequately describe the sight of the Himalayas? Can you ever capture in prose but a sliver of the awe of a panoramic photo, itself a crude imitation of the true experience?

Even with the true experience we find there is not one true experience. Some look out and see ancestors. Some see gods. Some see the ages long past. Some see fearsome obstacles or thrilling challenges.

So I can't tell you what exactly you'll find beyond that door. But I can tell you I look forward to trying to understand what you do.